

MODERN LANGUAGE NOTES

VOL. XXX.

BALTIMORE, NOVEMBER, 1915.

No. 7.

EATING A CITATION

Some editors of Nashe and Greene have supported the theory of Greene's authorship of *George a Greene, the Pinner of Wakefield*, by pointing to the similarity between the incident (Act 1, Sc. 2) where George a Greene forces the insolent Mannering, who comes with a commission from the rebel Earl of Kendall for supplies for his army from the town of Wakefield, to eat the three wax seals of his commission and see the commission itself torn into shreds, and an incident which is supposed to have been true of Greene himself. The yarn is briefly told by Nashe, in a defense of Greene:

"Had he liu'd, Gabriel, and thou shouldest so unarteficially and odiously libeld against him as thou hast done, he would haue made thee an example of ignominy to all ages that are to come, and drieren thee to eate thy owne booke butterd, as I sawe him make an Apparriter once in a Tauerne eate his Citation, waxe and all, very handsomely seru'd twixt two dishes."¹

This anecdote is taken not as the jest of a satirical writer, but rather seriously, by McKerrow, in a suggestion which he contributes for the "Notes on Publications" in the Malone Collections, Parts IV and V, 1911, pp. 289-90. As a possible explanation of the manuscript note on the title-page of the Duke of Devonshire's copy of the 1599 quarto of *George a Greene* to the effect that "Ed. Juby saith that y^e play was made by Ro. Greene," Mr. McKerrow proposes to construe the *by* as *for*, and hence, in this instance, virtually *about* Greene. After illustrating the usage, he goes on to say: "Robert Greene was a well-known figure in his day, and was undoubtedly much talked of after his death. Is it not possible that Juby fancied that the incident of George a Greene and Mannering in the play had been suggested by Robert Greene's treatment of the apparitor; and that the true meaning of the note is not that the play was written by Greene, but that

it was aimed at him or made use of incidents of his life?"

The incident occurs in several places. It is found in full in the prose romance on which *George a Greene* is based, the manuscript of which has been supposed to belong to the late sixteenth or early seventeenth century (the earliest extant printed copy being dated 1706). It is not known whether this prose version is later or earlier than the play, but it has been pretty generally assumed that the play is founded on the prose version in one form or another. The action is substantially the same in play and romance, the romance having an added touch of realism in Mannering's choking on the seals and being given a bowl of ale to wash them down, a detail which appears, doubled, in a similar incident in *Sir John Oldcastle* (1600).

The whole scene in *Sir John Oldcastle* (Act 2, Sc. 1) is on a larger scale. The Summoner here is a sort of stock character, whose traits, dramatically suggested by soliloquy and dialogue, carry with them a faint suggestion of the kind of wickedness so earnestly inveighed against in church councils in the Middle Ages, and so humorously hit off by Chaucer in the character of his summoner to ecclesiastical courts. One may imagine the "taking down" of such a character as furnishing great enjoyment to the audience even as late as the seventeenth century, the summoner being so generally unpopular.² The Sumner appears at Sir

¹ Strange Newes, 1592. Cf., McKerrow, I, 271, line 25.

² Special abuses of the office of summoner, or purvant, of the ecclesiastical courts during the period 1580-96 may have led to the revival of good old stories about wicked summoners and also encouraged the summoned to acts of violence against the messengers. In the Acts of the Privy Council for 1580 (Eliz., Vol. iv, p. 820) there is a letter to the Lord Bishop of London "with a supplicacion enclosed complaining of the attaching and sending for by his seruantes (to the abuse of the Commission Ecclesiasticall) for poore men to their great charges and hinderance, nothing at their coming being laid unto their charg, but offered to be excused for a little money." In spite of whatever action the Council may have taken, the abuse con-

John Oldcastle's place and attempts to serve a citation for him to appear at court before the Lord of Rochester. He is received by Harpoole, a member of Oldcastle's household, who

tinued. There are reprinted by the Historical MSS. Commission (Report 10, App. 2, p. 37) two letters to Bassingbourn Gawdy, of Norfolk, one under date of 28 June, 1593, from Sir Edward Stanhope and Dr. B. Swale, and one under date of 3 July, 1593, from the Archbishop of Canterbury, concerning the serving of a forged summons upon Gawdy by a "bad fellow," Thompson, the warrant being signed apparently by Drs. Cosin, Swale, and Drury. The Archbishop hopes that Gawdy "will yet further discover the knot of these cozeners . . . and disburden the poor people of such filthy cormorants." Matters had evidently reached a crisis by 1596, for at that date, according to Strype (*Annals*, Vol. iv, no. ccvii), there was published a "proclamation against sundry abuses practised by divers lewd and audacious persons falsely naming themselves messengers of her majesty's chamber; travelling from place to place, with writings counterfeited in form of warrants." Associated with these false messengers were those from the ecclesiastical courts. "Deceitful persons, falsely taking upon them to be messengers of her chamber; and for that purpose undutifully wearing boxes, or escutcheons of arms, as the messengers do; being associated with others of like bad disposition; have, and still do go up and down the country, with writings in form of warrants, whereunto the names of the lords and others of her majesty's privy council, and other ecclesiastical commissioners, are by them counterfeited." The abuse has continued, according to the proclamation, in spite of the pillorying and branding of offenders after prosecution in Star Chamber. Fees have been taken for the messengers' services; and, to cover up their trickery, these false messengers have compounded with those living at a distance from the courts "to dispense with them for a sum of money, and to make their appearance before the said lords." To correct the abuse, messengers are forbidden in future to receive their fees until those summoned appear with them in court; and all compounding for a sum of money forbidden, under heavy penalties.

The "knot of cozeners," the "filthy cormorants" which the Archbishop of Canterbury refers to so feelingly in the summer of 1593 give a contemporary significance to the treatment of the character of the summoner in *George a Greene*, which is noted by Henslowe as an "old" play in December of the same year.

I am indebted for the references to these three items to a foot-note in Usher's *The Rise and Fall of the High Commission* (pp. 62-3).

not only denies him audience, but beats him severely, and obliges him to eat the one wax seal, though it were "as broad as the lead that couers Rochester Church," exhorting him, "Be champing, be chawing, sir." Harpoole gives him a draught of beer, and then continues the punishment by requiring him to eat the parchment commission itself, washing it down with a cup of sack. A reminder of this closing incident occurs in *2 Henry IV*, II, ii, 148, where Poins, after reading Falstaff's letter to the Prince, says, "My Lord, I will steepe this Letter in Sack and make him eat it."

Mr. McKerrow, in his note on Nashe's anecdote,³ cites two allusions to similar scenes in real life. One is in Scott's *Abbot*, Note F, 'Abbot of Unreason,' where "a similar incident is described as taking place at the castle of Borthwick in 1547." The other is a case reported in Pitcairn's *Criminal Trials in Scotland*, II, 346.

The case in Pitcairn is in part 2 of volume I of the Edinburgh 1833 edition (p. 346), and it is dated February 3, 1595, though the root of the whole trouble goes back to December, 1594. James Hamilton and his wife, Agnes Cockburn, and their four sons were "denounced rebels" for not answering to a complaint of James, Lord Lindsay, David Dundas, and John Yallowleis, Messenger (at arms). Yallowleis had been sent with two companions to carry four letters, among them a citation for the Hamiltons to appear at court to answer for certain misdemeanors. Hamilton and his sons had been having a hilarious time in the country round about, slaying cows and oxen, breaking up mills, and driving the millers from their work. Lord Lindsay and Dundas appeared personally to pursue the Hamiltons before the King and the Council; but the defendants absented themselves (Dec. 19, 1594). The Messenger went to the *Place of the Peill*, "and at the yett thairof, the said Agnes &c. cuming furth at the said yett, tuke the said messenger be the craig, struck him upone the heid, armes, and shoulderis, and gaif him mony bauch strikis with pistollettis; held bendit pistollettis to his breist, causit thame to sweir

³ Works of Nashe, IV, 163.

neuir to use ony Letteris agains thame; and in end, with mony threatningis and minassingis, in ane verie barbarous and uncouth maner, forceit the said Messinger to eit and swallie the haill copyis of the saidis Letteris, and tuke the principall Letteris frome him; and thaireftir, shamefullie and cruellie dang the said Witnessis with bendit pistollettis and quhinzearis, and left thame for deid: The lyke of quhilikis shamefull and presumptuus insolencies hes sendle bene hard of in the In-cuntry."

The dates preclude the possibility of influence of this case upon the play *George a Greene*, as the play is noted in *Henslowe's Diary* as old 29 December, 1593. If there is any connection, this is a case of a popular play influencing history, rather than history influencing the play. It is not necessary, however, to assume that the Hamiltons got their notion of how to treat the unwelcome messenger from this or any other play.

As early as 1290 a similar incident occurred in real life. In the *Rolls of Parliament*, I, p. 24, col. 2, no. 15, is recorded a case brought against Bogo de Clare by Johannes le Waleys, clerk, who carried letters of citation from the Archbishop of Canterbury to the home of Bogo. He was received by members of Bogo's household, who beat and otherwise maltreated him, and compelled him to eat the letters and even the seals appended:

"Bogo de Clare attachiatus fuit ad respondend' Johanni le Waleys, Clerico, de hoc, quod cum idem Johannes, die Dominica in Festo Sance Trinitatis proximo perterito, in pace Domini Regis, et ex parte Archiepiscopi Cantuar' intrasset domum predicti Bogonis in Civitate London et ibidem detulisset quasdam Litteras de Citatione quadam facienda, quidam de Familia predicti Bogonis ipsum Johannem Litteras illas et etiam sigilla appensa, vi et contra voluntatem suam, manducare fecerunt, et ipsum ibidem imprisonaverunt, verberaverunt, et male tractaverunt, contra Pacem Domini Regis, et ad Dampnum ipsius Johannis viginti Libr' et etiam in contemptum Domini Regis mille Libr'. Et inde producit sectam" &c.

Bogo put up as defence the fact that the injury had been inflicted without his knowledge or his orders, by members of his household. The King regarded the offence as enormous

because of the contempt of church and throne; but Bogo was allowed to go on condition that he would appear later, bringing some suspected members of his household to answer for the crime. He came with all his household except these particular men, "qui incontinenti post praedictum factum recesserunt et abierunt." Bogo was then dismissed and Johannes le Waleys advised to pursue the principal agents.

On reading Note F to Scott's *Abbot*, I was first inclined to view the story with suspicion as a possible combination of a good old anecdote, about how to treat a summoner, with a stock character, the Abbot of Unreason, or lord of misrule. But it seems to be founded on fact. In his *Essay on Provincial Antiquities of Scotland*, under the heading "Borthwick Castle," Scott quotes in full the record of the case as it was extracted for him from the Consistory Register of St. Andrews by the Scottish antiquary, J. Riddell, Esq., Advocate. It is dated 16 May, 1547.

"HAY, DOMINUS BORTHWICK."

"Eodem die (die lunæ) Willielmus Langlandis baculus literarum cititarum Domini Officialis emanatarum super Johannem Dominum Borthwik ad instantiam Magistri Georgii Hay de Nynzeane et literarum excommunicandum pro nonnullis testibus contumacibus, juravitque quod Idem Willielmus baculus presentavit literas hujusmodi Curato dictæ ecclesie pro earundem executione facienda die dominico decimo quinto die mensis instantis Maii ante initium summe misse. Qui Curatus easdem ante summam missam deponenti redeliberavit, et dixit, se velle easdem exequi post summam missam. Et supervenit quidem vulgariter nuncupatus ye Abbot of Unressone of Borthwick, cum suis complicibus, and causit him passe wyt yam quhill he come to ye mylne-dam, at ye south syde of ye castell, and compellit him to lope in ye wattir, and quhan he had loppin in ye wattir, ye said Abbot of Unressone, saide ye deponent was not weite aneuche nor deip aneuche, and wyt yat keist him dounie in ye watter by ye shulderis. And yerefter ye deponent past agane to ye kirk, and deliverit yaim to ye curate for executione of ye samyn. And you, ye said Abbot of Unressone, came, and tuke ye letters furt of ye Curate's hand, and gaif ye deponent ane glasse full of wyne, and raif ye letters, and mulit ye samyn amangis ye wyne, and causit ye deponent drynk ye wyne

ande eit ye letters, and saide, gif ony maa
lettres came yair, salang as he war lord, yai
sulde gang ye said gait: propterea iudex de-
crevit Curatum citandum ad deponendum super
nomine et cognomine dicti Abbatis de Unres-
sone et suorum Complicium et literas in futurum
exequendas in vicinioribus ecclesiis. Et
dictus Abbas et complices excommunicandus
quam primo constare poterit de eorundem
nominibus.”⁴

The details of this situation are so dissimilar to those of *George a Greene* that it is quite unnecessary to assume any relationship between the historical case and the play; for there is nothing in the incident narrated that accounts for anything lacking in the prose romance of *George a Greene*. There are a few details in which the situation at Borthwick castle resembles that in *Sir John Oldcastle*. A summoner is sent from an ecclesiastical court bearing unwelcome letters of an official nature. He is forced to eat the letters steeped in wine. The whole affair of the Abbot of Unreason, the setting of the church service, the ducking in the mill-dam—these are all irrelevant to our purpose. The only distinctive feature of the story that reappears in *Oldcastle* and is not sufficiently accounted for otherwise is the use of the wine.

Mr. J. R. MacArthur seems to feel that this item needs accounting for. In his dissertation on The First Part of *Sir John Oldcastle* he discusses the relation of the Oldcastle incident to that of *George a Greene*. He notes the close parallelism between the play and the prose romance of *George a Greene* up to the point where the pindar forces Mannerling to swallow the seals.

“Here the scene in the play closes. In the romance the treatment of the unfortunate messenger is somewhat more humane, for *George a Greene*, seeing the Sumner almost choked, sends for a cup of sack, which the poor wretch drinks. This proves that, although the authors of *Sir John Oldcastle* may have known Greene's play, of which an edition was published in 1599, they could not have derived from it this incident, which seems to have existed elsewhere. There was, moreover, a ballad on the subject of the Pindar of Wakefield, a

few lines of which are quoted in the two plays of ‘The Downfall’ and ‘The Death of Robert, Earl of Huntingdon.’ We shall see a little later that Munday, one of the authors of Sir John Oldcastle, was concerned in the composition of these plays. Hence it is probable that some version of the story was accessible to the writers of Oldcastle other than that given in Greene's play. From the latter they could not have derived the last incident of the story, the drinking of the ale.”⁵

Of course, if the prose version of *George a Greene* were accessible to the authors of *Oldcastle*, the use of the wine might be traced to that as a source. Or, perhaps some may choose to suppose a familiarity on the part of the playwrights with the 1547 case at Borthwick Castle. That the wine figured in an early version of *George a Greene* and was omitted purposely from the play is not inconceivable. It would not indicate less humanity in the treatment of the messenger so much as it would indicate a greater dignity, as well as brevity, in the handling of the scene. In the play of *George a Greene*, the action moves very rapidly at this point, with a minimum of talk between the pindar and the messenger, and a minimum of stage business. The choking over the seals and washing them down with wine (it will be remembered that in neither version of *George a Greene* is the letter eaten) would have exaggerated the farcical nature of the incident beyond the apparent intentions of the author. In spite of the essentially comic character of the incident, we get the impression of a certain strength and dignity of character in the hero. In *Oldcastle*, on the other hand, the comic features are expanded till the result is broad farce. The situation is visualized by the playwrights down to the slightest detail. To a writer who is dallying with the situation, expanding it with much talk, prolonging the agony of mastication and of swallowing, what more natural than to hit upon the idea of washing down the choking stuff with wine,—and then, of multiplying the incident by two? The wine may be traced to two possible sources, provided we assume a sufficiently early date for the prose

⁴ Cadell, Edinburgh, edition of 1834, p. 205.

⁵ University of Chicago, Scott, Foresman & Co., 1907, p. 49.

romance underlying *George a Greene*; but is it, after all, really necessary to assume that the authors of *Oldcastle* were incapable of inventing this bit of business? It seems to me entirely possible that several writers handling this situation might invent this independently, because it occurs so naturally the moment one begins to visualize the process of chewing wax seals and parchment and trying to swallow them. It is only a question of how many sources it is desirable to assume for the treatment in *Sir John Oldcastle*.

George a Greene is practically rejected as a source of *Oldcastle* by R. S. Forsythe who says, in commenting on Schelling's derivation, that "a careful comparison of the three scenes in question will show only the germ of both the later ones in that in *George a Greene*, while there is, on the other hand, a close correspondence between that in *Henry V* and that in *Oldcastle*." Mr. Forsythe draws up an extremely careful parallel between the Oldcastle incident and that in *Henry V*, Act V, Sc. 1, to which one cannot do justice without quotation:

"Fluellen and Gower enter, the former with a leek in his hat; and in response to a question from Gower he says that he will force Pistol to eat it. Pistol enters swaggering, and is accosted by Fluellen. The latter comes to the point and bids Pistol eat the leek. He refuses contemptuously. Then Fluellen beats him and continues at short intervals to do so, all the time discoursing upon the virtues of the leek until it, and even its skin, is eaten. Then Fluellen gives Pistol a groat to mend his broken pate, while Gower reproves him for his previous actions. In Oldcastle a summoner (corresponding to Pistol) enters before Lord Cobham's (*Sir John Oldcastle's*) house, with a process from the Bishop of Rochester's Court to serve upon Oldcastle. Harpoole, the faithful servant of Oldcastle, appears and learns the summoner's business. He examines the parchment which the officer has, and then comes to his point—the forcing of its bearer to eat it. The officer, who is, at his entrance, quite assured in bearing, attempts to brave it out. Harpoole beats him, however, until, protesting very vigorously—as does Pistol—he eats the summons. While he does so, Harpoole ironically praises its wholesomeness. As Fluellen makes Pistol eat the skin of the leek, so does Harpoole force the summoner to eat the waxen seal on the parchment. After the docu-

ment has been disposed of, Harpoole calls the butler and orders a pot of beer for the summoner, with which to wash down his lunch. The beer having been drunk, the officer is dismissed, Harpoole in the meantime giving him certain directions concerning his future conduct."⁶

Mr. Forsythe is evidently assuming the stage performance of a version similar to that of the Folio of *Henry V* to have been the source of the scene in *Sir John Oldcastle*. It were a pity to attempt to mar the exquisite symmetry of the parallel by attacking it in any one part. Fortunately that is not necessary. For the average person's common sense will rebound to the conclusion that, while the situations requiring the sending of the message are by no means identical in *George a Greene* and *Sir John Oldcastle*, they are much more similar to each other than is either to that in *Henry V*; for the serving of a disagreeable official message is considerably more like itself than it is like the serving of even the most fragrant leek upon an unwilling man; for eating purposes three wax seals are rather more like one wax seal than they are like an onion skin; and the destruction of a commission, whether by tearing it to pieces only or by eating it, has no essential similarity to the heroic demolition of an onion. How natural it is to close such a scene as that in *Oldcastle* with good advice to top off the maltreatment may be seen by referring to the incident at Borthwick Castle, 1547, and the Scotch law case in Pitcairn (1594-5). One needs no special source for so natural a detail as this.

Confronted with a choice between *George a Greene* and *Henry V* as sources for *Sir John Oldcastle*, one would without hesitation accept *George a Greene*. But it is very clear that the general framework of *Sir John Oldcastle* is not at all accounted for by that of *George a Greene*, romance or play. A very substantial resemblance will be found between the earliest historical case that I have found, that of Bogo de Clare in 1290, and the treatment in *Sir John Oldcastle*. In both the messenger sent is a summoner from an ecclesiastical court, who carries

⁶ *Mod. Lang. Notes*, 26, 104-7.

an unwelcome citation to a lord of a household. The summoner is received by one or more members of the lord's household, and, with a beating in one case and threats of a beating in the other, is forced to eat not only the letters but the seals. These are the only two versions here discussed in which both letter and seals are swallowed. There is still another respect in which these versions correspond and in which they differ from the others. There is a sequel to the incident. Bogo de Clare later answers at the King's Court for the offense, but is allowed to go free because the defense pleads that not Bogo himself, but a member of the household, without his master's knowledge or consent, committed the offense. Similarly there is a later scene in *Sir John Oldcastle* (Act II, Sc. iii) where the hero appears before the King's court to answer for his conduct. Here the King takes Oldcastle's part and not the Bishop's, and assists him in establishing the defense that, as he was absent when the offense occurred, he is not responsible for the actions of the members of his household. Like Bogo, Oldcastle goes free on the ground that suit must be brought against the principal agent, and the lord is not responsible for his servant's actions if they are without his knowledge.

I should not care to insist that the Rolls of Parliament were inspected by the authors of *Sir John Oldcastle*, and that the law case here cited was the direct source of the two scenes in *Sir John Oldcastle*. But it is worth while noting that there is a substantial similarity in narrative detail. Forcing a messenger to eat unwelcome letters seems to have been a favorite diversion in England and Scotland for several centuries, judging from the number of allusions that survive. A slight resemblance to the situation may be found in another case in Scotland, noted in *Bannatyne's Journal*, p. 243. In the reign of Mary, one of the Queen's pursuivants, sent out to proclaim everything null which had been done against her in her imprisonment, was forced to eat his letters, was beaten, and warned not to come that way again.⁷ We have, in addition to this inexactly

⁷ See Scott's *Essay on Border Antiquities*, p. 71, note.

dated occurrence, three law cases, 1290, 1547, 1594-5; the prose romance of *George a Greene*, of uncertain date but probably existent before 1593; the play of the same name, played as old, 29 Dec. 1593, and the play of *Sir John Oldcastle*, first performed in 1599. In view of the evident popularity of the custom of forcing a messenger to eat unwelcome letters, whether in real life or on the stage, need we attach any weight to Nashe's little anecdote about Greene's treatment of the apparitor in the tavern? The personal anecdote was as popular in the times of Elizabeth and James as it is to-day. The jest-books show the habit of attaching good old stories to new characters that they seem to fit. How universal such a habit is will be understood by anyone who ever undertook to collect the stories told as true of any public man who got a real hold upon the popular imagination—say Abraham Lincoln, for example. Greene was certainly one type of man that could be expected to accrete anecdotes; and in the incident there is some artistic fitness to the popular conception of Greene's conduct. Greene may, of course, have done exactly the thing attributed to him by Nashe; but in view of the historical incidents above related, it seems entirely possible that Nashe's little anecdote was but a jesting allusion to what he expected every reader to recognize as a well-known good old story. Certainly we should be cautious about concluding that Greene wrote *George a Greene* because of a parallel between the facts of the play and the facts of Greene's own life, or even that Juby fancied that the play was written either by or about Greene merely for this reason.⁸

EVELYN MAY ALBRIGHT.

The University of Chicago.

⁸ Brief notes on "Eating of Seals" (most of which are indexed under "Oldcastle") were contributed to *Notes and Queries*, 1893-8. The most important are those by Edward Peacock, 8th S. iii, 124 and 9th S. i, 305, in one of which he raises the query whether the compulsory seal-eating ever occurred or whether the anecdotes he reprints from various sources are to be regarded only as jests.

THE INFLUENCE OF COOPER'S *THE SPY* ON HAUFF'S *LICHTENSTEIN*

In recent years there has appeared a number of critical essays showing the influence of various works in English literature upon the writings of Wilhelm Hauff. The German novelist's indebtedness to Walter Scott¹ and Washington Irving² have been satisfactorily demonstrated. Upon investigation it has been found that with the above-mentioned authors there must be included a writer whose influence upon Hauff seems to have hitherto passed unnoticed; namely, the American novelist, James Fenimore Cooper. This paper proposes to show that Cooper's *The Spy* is a source for Hauff's novel *Lichtenstein*.

The Spy was first published in 1821, and two translated editions of it appeared in Germany in 1824, two years before the publication of *Lichtenstein*. It at once became popular in Germany and, as Dr. Barba says,³ "assured Cooper's success on the Continent." The German critics hailed Cooper as the "American Scott." Hauff's admiration for Scott is well known, and it is scarcely probable that he should have remained unacquainted with the works of a man who was being so favorably compared with the great English novelist. As a matter of fact, Hauff really was familiar with Cooper, as statements from his sketch *Die Bücher und die Lesewelt* show. In this sketch the bookseller is made to say, "Ich streite Scott und den beiden Amerikanern (Cooper, Irving) ihr Verdienst nicht ab; sie sind im Gegenteil leider zu gut." Further he adds, in giving an example of how the philistine is wont to criticize an author, "Er (indefinite; author criticized by the philistine) ist doch nicht so schön als Walter Scott und Cooper, und nicht so tief und witzig als Washington Irving. Und welcher Segen für unsere Literatur und den Buchhandel wird

aus diesem Samen (Scott, Cooper, Irving) hervorgehen, den man so reichlich ausstreut?" These quotations have been used as concrete proofs of Hauff's acquaintance with Irving and to some extent also with Scott, so there is no reason why they should not perform the same function in the case of Cooper.

Hauff's chief indebtedness to *The Spy* is for the character of the Piper of Hardt. Most commentators on *Lichtenstein* are somewhat at variance in their explanation of this character; in fact, it has seemed to be one of the few cruxes which the book furnishes. Three papers dealing with Hauff's relations to Scott have been read before the Modern Language Association. In 1900 C. W. Eastman in his paper, in which he maintained that *Ivanhoe* was Hauff's chief Scottian source for *Lichtenstein*, said, "The most original character in *Lichtenstein* is without question the Pfeifer von Hardt, and there seems to be no one person in *Ivanhoe* to whom he seems to exactly correspond."⁴ Three years later (1903), W. H. Carruth showed that *Lichtenstein* bore more resemblances to *Waverley* than to *Ivanhoe*. In regard to the character of the Piper he said, "Hauff's materials are if anything more attractive than those of Scott, and, as they were indigenous, he was forced to treat them in his own manner."⁵ The most comprehensive of these papers was that read by G. W. Thompson in 1911. In it is found the following concerning the Piper: "On the other hand, the Pfeifer von Hardt is a strange composite of Scottian functions. In him we find a guide, spy, messenger, soldier, friend, musician, and general utility man for the hero-heroine-prince interest."⁶ A German critic, Max Drescher, in dealing with Hauff's sources⁷ considers the character of the Piper as purely the invention of the author and states, "Alle drei Elemente nun, sowohl das der Treue gegen den Herrn als das plötzliche Auftreten

¹Cf. G. W. Thompson, *Wilhelm Hauff's Specific Relation to Walter Scott*, *Pub. Mod. Lang. Assn.* XXVI (1911), 549-91.

²Cf. Otto Plath, *Washington Irving's Einfluss auf Wilhelm Hauff*, *Euphorion* XX, 459-71.

³P. A. Barba, *Cooper in Germany*, *Indiana University Studies*, No. 21.

⁴*Americana Germanica* III (1900), 388. See also *Pub. Mod. Lang. Assn.* XV (1900), Append., p. lxxv.

⁵*Pub. Mod. Lang. Assn.* XVIII (1903), 525.

⁶*Pub. Mod. Lang. Assn.* XXVI (1911), 570.

⁷*Die Quellen zu Hauff's Lichtenstein*, Leipzig, 1905, p. 145.

und das Geheimnisvolle, das erst am Schlusse seine Aufklärung findet, hat Hauff in seinem Pfeifer von Hardt vereinigt und ihm damit jene Eigenart und Wirkung verliehen, die ihn zu einer der interessantesten Gestalten unseres Romans machen."

In addition to the fact that a few of the critics seem to consider the Piper to be a character original with Hauff, the majority of them agree on one point at least, that he is a complex character, whatever be his source. Several men have tried to show that the character of the Piper is a kind of synthesis of elements taken from a considerable number of Scottian characters. There does not appear to be any single character in Scott's works which is endowed with more than a very few of the distinctive traits belonging to the Piper. There is one Cooperian character, however, which in composition and function is nearly identical with the Piper. That character is Harvey Birch, the hero of *The Spy*.

Considering the Piper and Birch in detail, we find in the first place that both authors, Cooper and Hauff, have endowed their respective characters with almost the same physical characteristics. Both Birch and the Piper possess extraordinary bodily strength, and remarkable endurance and dexterity, qualities which the ordinary observer would scarcely attribute to the men from their appearance. Their eyes are of the same cold gray color and are especially commented upon in both cases. The remarkable control which both of these men have over themselves is emphasized repeatedly. They are able to change their manner and bearing at will. An excellent example of this power in the Piper is the difference in his bearing on the first and second days in Ulm (*Lichtenstein*, Pt. I; Chs. VIII, IX).⁸ Hauff says of him in this connection, "Welche Gewalt musste dieser Mensch über sich haben! Es war derselbe, und doch schien er ein ganz anderer." Several instances of the same ability on the part of Birch are to be found in Bk. I, Ch. III, of *The Spy*.⁹

⁸ References to *Lichtenstein* are to the Kürschner Edition of Hauff's Works, Vol. I.

⁹ References to *The Spy* are to the 2nd Edition, 2 vols., New York, 1822.

There we have him characterized by such remarks as "his whole system seemed altered;" and "the whole manner of Birch was altered." This extraordinary power of self-control is also shown in another manner, in the cleverness, namely, with which both men wear disguises and actually seem to assume the character of the people they are feigning to be. In one instance Birch disguises himself as a sutler-woman and in another as a country parson, and in both cases he plays his part so skillfully that he is able to deceive the shrewd American soldiers. In a like manner the Piper disguises himself as a peddler to gain information in Tübingen.

The narrative of the trip through the mountains on which the Piper acts as guide to Georg Sturmfeder contains many striking parallels to the account of a similar trip in *The Spy*¹⁰ on which Birch acts as guide for Capt. Wharton. The chief points of similarity in the stories of these trips are noted as follows:

1. The unusual familiarity of both the Piper and Birch with the mountains is commented upon. These two guides know every path and by-way, and the situation of all the farms, villages, etc.

2. Both parties stop beside a brook to enjoy a lunch which the guide has brought along in a "wallet." Compare the following parallel passages:

"Am Rande eines schattigen Buchenwäldchens, wo eine klare Quelle und frische Rosen zur Ruhe einlud, machten sie halt. Georg stieg ab, und sein Führer zog aus seinem Sack ein gutes Mittagsmahl."¹¹

"After reaching the summit of a hill, Harvey seated himself by the side of a little run and opening the wallet that he had slung where his pack was commonly suspended, he invited his comrade to partake of the coarse fare that it contained."¹²

3. Both guides make a sudden deviation in their course and lead away at almost right angles from the path they have been following in order to avoid parties of the enemy.

4. Troops of the enemy's horsemen pass close by.

¹⁰ Bk. II, Ch. XVI.

¹¹ *Lichtenstein*, p. 104.

¹² *The Spy*, II, 240.

5. In certain vicinities the guides take unusual precautions to escape falling into the hands of the enemy.

6. The descent from the hills to the lowlands is particularly mentioned in both accounts.

The similarity of the relations between the Piper and Duke Ulrich of Württemberg and those between Birch and Washington is also worthy of consideration. In *Lichtenstein* the Duke does not enter into the action until late in the story and then for a time he remains incognito. For a period of some weeks his chief place of shelter is a cave where the Piper is his only attendant and chief informer. The remarkable devotion of the Piper to the Duke is repeatedly shown. In *The Spy* we catch a glimpse of Washington, incognito, in the first chapter of the book and then he does not enter into the story again until near the end. Even then he remains incognito and it is only in the next to last chapter (Bk. II, Ch. XVIII) that his identity is revealed. He frequently meets Birch, the spy, in a lonely rendezvous which is half cave, half hut. Birch is his chief informer as to the movements of the enemy. The splendid loyalty of Birch to his country and his devotion to Washington are shown in the scene of the last meeting of the two men (Bk. II, Ch. XVIII).

In addition to the similarities in the characters of the Piper and Harvey Birch mentioned above, the following close resemblances should also be noted:

1. Both characters belong to relatively the same class of society. Birch cannot be called a peasant, for no such class has ever been recognized in America, but he belonged to the class which most nearly corresponded to that which in Europe was designated by the term *peasant*.

2. The Piper, like Birch, is known among the enemy as a spy. The enemy are continually trying to capture him and his life is constantly in jeopardy, as is the case with Birch.

3. The fact that both these men are away from home for weeks and months at a time is commented upon by those whom they have left behind them at home.¹⁸

¹⁸ Cf. especially *Lichtenstein*, p. 127; and *The Spy*, I, 149.

4. Birch brings a warning to Capt. Wharton which is unheeded until it is too late to avoid capture (*The Spy*, Bk. I, Ch. IV). The same is true of the warning which the Piper brings to Georg (*Lichtenstein*, Pt. I, Chs. VIII, IX).

5. Both men aid considerably in furthering the development of the principal love interest. Birch's part in the love affair of Major Dunwoodie and Frances Wharton may not seem very evident, but upon close observation it will be found to be fully equal to the Piper's part in the love affair of Georg and Marie.

6. Both men die fighting for the cause which they have loved and long served so well.

In his statement quoted above, Dr. Thompson describes the Piper of Hardt as a "composite of Scottian functions" which he designates as "guide, spy, messenger, soldier, friend, musician, and general utility man for the hero-heroine-prince interest." It will be found to be true that the character of Harvey Birch performs all these functions with the exception of one. We do not find mention of Birch possessing any musical talent; but it must be remembered that the Piper's profession of musician serves the same purpose as Birch's peddling, namely, to conceal his actions as spy and informer for the cause which he served.

There are other interesting analogies in the plot, structure, and content of the two works under consideration, but as in most cases parallel analogies with one or more of Scott's novels are also found, one is more prone to give credit for these similarities to Scottian sources. Yet it is not possible to deny absolutely that Cooper also had some share in influencing Hauff in these respects. For the sake of illustration, a few of the analogies (between *The Spy* and *Lichtenstein*) referred to above are here given:

1. A strong friendship between men fighting on opposite sides—Sturmfeuer and Frondsberg in *Lichtenstein*; Capt. Wharton and Major Dunwoodie in *The Spy*.

2. The two chief female characters are in love with men of opposite parties.

3. The hero of *Lichtenstein* and the character most nearly corresponding to him in *The Spy*, Major Dunwoodie, both save and befriend persons of the other side.

4. The two principal female characters are closely related.

5. The parties in the principal love affair are engaged before the commencement of the action.

6. A mysterious stranger visits the home of the heroine. This stranger proves to be the leader in the political interest and plays an analogous part in the action of both novels.

The facts presented show quite conclusively, it is believed, that Cooper's *The Spy*, as a source for Hauff's *Lichtenstein*, must be reckoned along with the number of other influences which have been shown to have had their effect on this novel. It is not contended that Cooper's influence has been more than a minor one, but, nevertheless, the pointing out of it will, it is hoped, clear up what has hitherto been a matter of some uncertainty and conjecture.

C. D. BRENNER.

Princeton University.

ROSTAND, MAGNE, AND BARO

If a lover of *Cyrano* chances to read *les Erreurs de documentation de Cyrano de Bergerac*,¹ his appreciation of the play will not be lessened by reason of the anachronisms that M. Magne discovers in it. He will, however, be led into error if he believes that the critic's documentation is everywhere superior to the poet's. This fact can be readily established if we read what Magne has to say in regard to Rostand's use of Baro's *Clorise*.

It will be remembered that this is the play in which Montfleury is acting when he is cruelly interrupted by Cyrano, and that Rostand in his stage directions dates the scene 1640. Here lies what Magne considers "l'erreur principale"² of the first act, for, as *la Clorise* first appeared in 1631,³ possessed little merit, and encountered

¹ By Emile Magne, Paris, 1898.

² P. 15.

³ *Ibid.* This date is correct, but Magne makes the further remark that the play was printed in 1632, although the edition which he has had in his hands has the date 1631 in its *achevé d'imprimer*.

the rivalry of a number of better plays,⁴ he believes that it could not have been acted later than 1631. He then criticizes Rostand as if he had laid the scene in that year and points out the facts that at that time high society, and especially Richelieu, would not have come to the disreputable Hôtel de Bourgogne, that there could then be no reference to the *Cid*, that L'Epy, Jodelet, and other actors mentioned by Rostand were not then playing at the Hôtel de Bourgogne, that Montfleury was not in Paris, and that Cyrano himself was an eleven-year-old boy at school in the country.⁵

A portion of this criticism, clipped from the *Revue de France* and sent to Rostand, drew from the poet a letter in which with charming irony he pointed out that local color does not depend on historical minutiae, that he was aware of his anachronisms when he wrote the play, and that Magne's objections are of no value, as he refuses to accept 1640, which Rostand believes to be a reasonable date for a revival of *la Clorise*.⁶ Let me quote from Magne's emphatic reply to these wise words: "Vous posez comme des axiomes indiscutables les erreurs qui ont provoqué ma critique. 1640 fait tomber, dites-vous, une partie de mes observations.—Mais justement, 1640 est une date fausse et mes observations ne tomberont que devant la preuve d'une reprise de *la Clorise*. Et je doute que vous me la donniez jamais, car on se[n]e] songe guère à reprendre la pièce

* Numerous mistakes occur in this connection on pages 17 and 18, which would be of no importance in *Cyrano*, but which amaze us in one who professes devotion to accuracy. Rotrou did not bring out *Cléagénor et Doristée*, *Diane*, *Occasions perdues*, and *Heureuse Constance* in 1630 and 1631, but three years later; cf. Stiefel, *ZFSL*, XVI, 1-49. Rotrou's best plays were not written between 1631 and 1640, for *la Sœur*, *Venceslas*, and *Cosroës* appeared after the latter date. "Chauvreau" is a misprint for Chevreau. Gilbert's best plays were not written between 1631 and 1640, for his first piece came out in the latter year (cf. Chapelain, *Lettres*, I, 656, 657) and his others were subsequent to it.

⁵ Pp. 19 seq. Magne appears to be ignorant of the fact that the first representation of the *Cid* was at the Théâtre du Marais.

⁶ This autograph letter is published by Magne in his preface, pp. xviii, xix.

ancienne d'un auteur à l'instant où il en donne une nouvelle—surtout quand cet auteur est Baro."⁷ I, too, doubt whether Rostand has furnished this proof, but the following remarks may serve as a substitute.

"Qui songeait à *la Clorise* six mois après son apparition?" asks Magne.⁸ In the first place, the publishers probably did, as it was customary to wait six months after the appearance of a play before printing it.⁹ There were also a number of readers who thought of it, so many, indeed, that a second edition appeared in 1634. It was also thought of by the actors of the Hôtel de Bourgogne as late as the spring of 1633, at which time, if not later, a description of its *mise en scène* was incorporated in the *Mémoire* of Mahelot, a fact that furnishes good evidence of its being played after that date. Furthermore, the *Gazette* of February 2, 1636, declares that on January 27 of that year the *Cléoreste* of Baro was played before the queen at the Hôtel de Richelieu, and, on account of the similarity of name and the fact that we have no other evidence of the existence of a play called *Cléoreste*, the frères Parfaict¹⁰ have concluded that this was *la Clorise*. If we accept this opinion, which seems to me worthy of credence, the supposition that the play held the boards nine years and that it attracted the attention of Richelieu ceases to astonish us. In consideration of all these facts, Rostand ought not to be criticized for assuming a revival of the play in 1640.

But Magne does not stop here. He suggests that Rostand would have done better to select instead of *la Clorise* Baro's *Clarimonde*, which he declares to have been acted in 1640.¹¹ Unfortunately, he gives no authority for the latter statement and probably has none better than the marginal date given by the frères Parfaict. He should know that when these authors do not give their authority, this marginal date is merely

⁷ P. xxi.

⁸ P. 18.

⁹ Cf. Chapelain's letter of March 9, 1640.

¹⁰ V, 167-169.

¹¹ P. 18. As I have shown above, he uses the appearance of this new play as an argument against the revival of *la Clorise*.

their best guess. The play was printed in 1643. It may have been first acted in 1640, but certainly Rostand had no proof of it. If he had assumed such a date, he would have laid himself open to the same charge that Magne has brought against him. It is quite as probable that *la Clorise* was acted in 1640 as that *la Clarimonde* was.¹²

Rostand is right, then, in insisting that Magne's attack upon his use of *la Clorise* is as unwarranted from an historic as from an aesthetic point of view. It is hard to see how any one can so misunderstand the nature of art as to disparage *Cyrano* because of errors in historical detail. It is also remarkable that one who does so should lay himself open to attack with his own weapons. I would not, however, deal so harshly with Magne as he does with Rostand, for, despite his errors in documentation, Magne gives an interesting appreciation of Cyrano the man, however little sympathy he may feel for the inimitable Cyrano of the play.

H. CARRINGTON LANCASTER.

Amherst College.

NOTES ON ALL'S WELL THAT ENDS WELL

I

Parolles: He has everything that an honest man should not have; what an honest man should have, he has nothing.

First Lord: I begin to love him for this.

Bertram: For this description of thine honesty? A pox upon him for me! He is more and more a cat. (IV, III, 289 f.)

Bertram's question is an added stroke in the characterization of this spineless youth. Both his sense of moral values and his intelligence suffer in his inability to follow the First Lord's thought. Bertram would not have asked this question if he had understood why the First

¹² An additional error lies in Magne's assertion on p. 18 that none of Baro's plays were printed except *la Clorise*, in refutation of which statement I refer him to La Vallière, Soleinne, Brunet and the catalogue of the Bibliothèque Nationale.

Lord had expressed his love for Parolles only after he had heard the rascal slander him. However, what Bertram failed to perceive was evident to the seventeenth century hearers of the play, although not evident to our day.

The thought in the mind of the First Lord when he uttered these words was that "the slanders of the wicked are the commendations of the godly," as it is phrased in *Nathan Field's Remonstrance*, 1616 (*Shakespeariana*, 1889, p. 218); and since Parolles was a great knave, slander from his mouth was an unusual commendation.

The occurrence of this thought is frequent in the dramatic literature of this period; and required at that time no interpretation. Shakespeare uses it again in *Timon* (IV, III, 173):

Alcib. *I never did thee harm.*
Tim. *Yes, thou spok'st well of me.*
Alcib. *Call'st thou that harm?*

Ben Jonson knew the thought and made use of it in two of his plays.

Cynthia's Revels, Everyman's Ed., p. 177:

Crites. . . . *So they be ill men,*
If they speake worse, 'twere better; for
of such
To be dispraised is the most perfect
praise.

The Devil is an Ass, Everyman's Ed., p. 330:

Ever. You have made election
Of a most worthy gentleman!

Man. *Would one of worth*
Had spoke it! but now whence it comes,
it is
Rather a shame unto me than a praise.

Ever. Sir, I will give you any satisfaction.

Man. Be silent then: Falsehood commends
not Truth.

The Devil is an Ass, p. 344:

Fitz. (possessed of the Devil):
I'll feast them and their trains, a jus-
tice head and brains
Shall be the first.—

Sir P. Eith. The devil loves not justice,
 There you may see.

Be not you troubled, sir, the devil
speaks it.

Gosson's Pleasant Quipps for Upstart Gentlewomen (Percy Society, 31), p. 14:

This lesson old was taught in schooles;
 It's praise to be dispraisde of fooles.

Scourge of Drunkenness (Halliwell Edition, 1859), p. 18:

Though scoffingly they [drunkards] say he is pre-
 cise,
 Yet drunkards tongues his credit cannot staine:
For blest are they which have an evill report
By them which are right of the devils consort.

II

Within ten years it [virginity] will make itself two, which is a goodly increase, and the principal itself not much the worse for wear. (I, I, 158.)

The difficulty in this passage consists in disposing satisfactorily of the two-in-ten-year idea. From Hanmer to the present day the text has been violently changed to make it lie upon a Procrustean bed of critical misconception. It is, however, not to child-bearing, as the emendators have assumed in making their changes in the text, that "ten" and "two" refer.

Parolles is arguing against virginity in terms of interest upon money invested. "If you do not put it out to interest, 'you can not choose but lose by't.' Therefore, 'out with't.' If the law allows ten per cent. interest upon money invested (which in ten years will double itself) how much more profitable to you would be a venture in marriage? Your original investment, yourself, would double itself, by the birth of a child, in a much shorter time than would be necessary for your money to double. 'A goodly increase, and the principal not much the worse for wear.'"

In other words, that which makes itself "two" in "ten years" is not "virginity," but money put out to interest according to the legal Elizabethan rate of ten per cent.

Phillip Stubbes, in *The Anatomie of Abuses*, gives us evidence that ten per cent. was the legal rate. [New Shakespeare Society, Series VI, p. 124.] In reproving usury he quotes the law of his day to the effect that "thou shalt not take above ii.s. in the pound; x.li. in the hundred, and so forth." Another reference to the same legal rate is found in the moral play, *The Three Lords and the Three Ladies of London* [Tudor Facsimile Edition, H3.]:

Policy (Branding Usury):

Sirrah, *policy* gives you this marke, doo you see,
A little x. standing in the midd'st of a great C.,
Meaning thereby to let all men understand,
That you must not take above bare x. pound
in the hundred,
And that too much too, and so be packing quietly.

Shakespeare associates in other places the general ideas of usury and of procreation. "Twas never merry world," Pompey says (*All's Well*, III, ii, 6), "since of two usuries, the merriest was put down, and the worser allowed by order of the law a furred gown to keep him warm." Again in *Twelfth Night* (III, i, 43), Feste, pointing to the coin that he has just received, inquires, "Would not a pair of these have bred?" Viola's reply is, "Yes, being kept together and put to use."

In two other passages Shakespeare recurs, in figurative speech, to the idea of interest doubling the principal in ten years. In one of them (Sonnet VI) he makes use of this idea in way of argument to persuade to marriage:

Sonnet VI.

That use is not forbidden usury,
Which happies those that pay the willing loan;
That's for thyself to breed another thee,
Or ten times happier, be it ten for one;
Ten times thyself were happier than thou art,
If ten of thine ten times refigu'd thee;

Richard III (IV, iv, 324):

The liquid drops of tears that you have shed
Shall come again, transform'd to orient pearls,
Advantaging their loan with interest
Of ten times double gain of happiness.

Another example of the idea of ten years' interest doubling the principal is found in the allegorical play *The Three Lords and the Three Ladies of London* (Tudor Facsimile Edition, H2):

Ne(mo) (of *Lucre* when giving her in marriage to *Pompe*):

Take her Lord pomp, I give her unto thee,
Wishing your good *may ten times doubled be.*

Pom(pe): *The wished good this world could give to me.*

III

Here is a pur of fortune's, sir, or of fortune's cat,—
(V, II, 19.)

An examination of the scene in which "pur" occurs, reveals a striking unity of thought emphasizing Parolles' decline in fortune. Parolles, in introducing himself to the Clown after his disgrace in camp, is the first to announce his changed condition: "I have ere now, sir, been better known to you, when I have held familiarity with fresher clothes; but I am now, sir, muddied in fortune's mood and smell somewhat strong of her strong displeasure." The Clown in reply emphasizes Parolles' misfortune, and introduces him to Lafeu as "a pur of fortune's," or as one entirely changed from the one time gallantly attired soldier. Afterwards Parolles describes himself to Lafeu as "a man whom fortune hath cruelly scratched." The emphasis of the scene is placed entirely upon Parolles' decline from prosperity to poverty.

The *Oxford Dictionary* does not record two examples of "pur" that are found in Marston's *What You Will* (1607), in a passage descriptive of the game of battledore and shuttlecock. In this passage young women are banteringly speaking to one another in terms of the game, while engaged in tossing the shuttlecock back and forth. Suddenly the banter is interrupted, presumably by the missing of a stroke by one of the players. Hereupon her opponent, in sudden interruption of what she was saying, exclaims, "(pur); 'tis downe, serve again, good wench." The game is then resumed, until

amidst the gaiety of the conversation it is interrupted by the second parenthetical "pur," with the speaker's laughing comparison of her lovers to shuttlecocks that she plays with "till they be downe."

The passage itself will make what I have said clearer (Halliwell's Ed. of Marston's Dramatic Works, 1856, Vol. I, p. 272 ff.):

Luc(ia). Madam, here is your shuttlecock.
Mel(etza). . . . Come, you, You prate: yfaith,
 Ile tosse you from post to piller!
Cel(ia). You post and I piller.
Mel. No, no, you are the onely post; you
 must support, prove a wench, and
 beare; or else all the building of your
 delight will fall—
Cel. Downe.
Lyz. What, must I stand out?
Mel. I, by my faith, til you be married.
Lyz. Why do you tosse then?
Mel. Why, I am wed, wench.
Cel. Pree thee to whome?
Mel. To the true husband, right head of a
 woman—my wit, which vowes never
 to marry till I meane to be a fool, a
 slave, starch cambrick ruffs, and make
 candells (*pur*); *tis downe, serve again,*
 good wench.
Luc. By your pleasing cheeke, you play well.
Mel. Nay, good creature, pree thee doe not
 flatter me. . . . I have a plaine
 waighting wench . . . she shall
 never have above two smockes to her
 back, for thatts the fortune of desert,
 and the maine in fashion or reward of
 merit (*pur*); *just thus do I use my*
 servants. I strive to catch them in
 my racket, and no sooner caught, but
 I tosse them away; if he flie wel, and
 have good feathers, I play with them
 til he be downe, and then my maide
 serves him to me againe; if a slug,
 and weake-wing'd, if hee bee downe,
 there let him lie."

A detailed account of battledore and shuttlecock would doubtless give further information about the exact use of "pur" in the game. It seems clear, however, from this passage that it signals the falling of the shuttlecock to the ground and consequently the temporary discontinuance of the game. Shakespeare borrows this technical term from the game, and with transferred meaning applies it to Parolles

who has been struck down by the force of fortune's blows. In this connection it is of interest to recall that we have in our common "tossed from pillar to post" a phrase that preserves the technical terms of battledore and shuttlecock to describe the buffettings of fortune. In calling Parolles "a pur of fortune's," the comparison of man to a shuttlecock tossed from pillar to post is carried a step further. In the Clown's words, Parolles has been more than merely "tossed from pillar to post"; he has suffered so much that he can no longer sustain himself amidst the blows of fortune; and, falling to the ground, has become a "pur of fortune's."

M. P. TILLEY.

University of Michigan.

SOURCES OF AN ECLOGUE OF FRANCISCO DE LA TORRE

The little volume of poems of Francisco de la Torre, published by Quevedo at Madrid in 1631,¹ contains eight eclogues which in beauty of form and language are entitled to be ranked with the best pastoral poetry in the Spanish language. His third eclogue, entitled *Eco*, is exquisite in its charming simplicity. The shepherd Amintas, after bidding his dog Melampo guard his sheep from the wolf, lies down to lament the indifference of Amarilis. He calls upon Echo whose voice still fills the woods, as she mourns eternally the loss of her Narcissus. Then he asks Mother Nature to receive his weary body, and begs unhappy Echo to join him in his grief.

The introduction, consisting of fourteen lines, is a translation of the opening verses of the eclogue entitled *Iolas* of Andrea Navagero, who, it will be remembered, suggested to Boscán

¹This volume was reprinted at Madrid in 1753 and Mr. Archer M. Huntington published a facsimile of the rare first edition at New York in 1903. The eight eclogues may also be read in Vol. VII of Sando's *Parnaso español*, Madrid, 1773.

in the year 1526 the advisability of attempting to employ Italian measures in Spanish poetry. A comparison of the following lines with the introduction to Francisco de la Torre's third eclogue will show the extent of the Spanish poet's indebtedness.²

Pascite, oves, teneras herbas per pabula læta,
 Pascite, nec plenis ignavæ parcite campis:
 Quantum vos tota minuetis luce, refectum
 Fecundo tantum per noctem rore resurget.
 Hinc dulci distenta tumescens ubera lacte,
 Sufficientque simul fiscellæ, et mollibus agnis.
 Tu vero vigil, atque canum fortissime, Teucon,
 Dum pascent illæ late per prata, luporum
 Incursus subitos, sevæisque averte rapinas.
 Interea hic ego muscoso prostratus in antro
 Ipse meos solus tecum meditabor amores:
 Atque animi curas dulci solabor avena.³

The remaining ninety-four lines of Francisco de la Torre's third eclogue are almost a literal translation of Navagero's Latin eclogue entitled *Acon*, in which the poet begs Echo to share his grief at the cruelty of the nymph Telayra. The last eight lines of the Latin version were not translated by Francisco de la Torre, but with this exception, the two versions are practically identical.

In addition to the fact that many of the poets of the Renaissance interpreted the classical doctrine of *imitatio* as justification for borrowing the ideas of another author, and that translations from a foreign tongue were regarded as a legitimate form of scholarship, we can in no wise bring the charge of plagiarism against Francisco de la Torre since he did not publish his own verse.⁴ I have indicated the sources of his third eclogue merely in order to

²Andreae Naugerii, *Opera Omnia*, Venetiis, 1754, pp. 180-81.

³For the indebtedness of Ronsard in his second eclogue to Navagero's *Iolas*, see an article by Paul Kuhn entitled *L'Influence néo-latine dans les élogues de Ronsard*, published in the *Revue d'histoire littéraire de la France*, Vol. XXI, 1914, pp. 317-25.

⁴For the indebtedness of Francisco de la Torre to sonnets of Torquato Tasso, Giambattista Amalteo and Benedetto Varchi, see James Fitzmaurice-Kelly, *Historia de la literatura española*, Madrid, 1913, pp. 242-43.

furnish additional evidence of the influence of Navagero's poetry on Spanish literature.⁵

J. P. WICKERSHAM CRAWFORD.

University of Pennsylvania.

P. SIPMA, *Phonology and Grammar of Modern West Frisian* with phonetic texts and glossary. (Publications of the Philological Society, II.) London, Oxford University Press, 1914. vii + 175 pp.

No other Germanic language is so closely related to Anglo-Saxon and English as the Old Frisian. The similarity when looked at from the point of view of historical phonetics, is so perfect that Anglo-Saxon may be regarded as one of the Early Frisian dialects. Its separation from the other Frisian dialects in the course of the fifth century meant for Anglo-Saxon a separate history and accordingly the development of many individual peculiarities. In spite of these peculiar Anglo-Saxon traits, however, the comparison of the Frisian dialects remains most instructive and one of the most important aids for the study of Anglo-Saxon.

Unfortunately our records of the Old Frisian language are rather scant. With the exception of a few not very important Runic inscriptions, there are hardly any records left of the period contemporary with Anglo-Saxon. The sources generally called 'Old Frisian' should, strictly speaking, be termed Middle Frisian, inasmuch as they are contemporary with Middle High German, Middle Low German, Middle English, etc. These sources, moreover, consist almost exclusively of collections of Frisian laws. If we apply to these the term 'literature,' we might

⁵Menéndez y Pelayo mentioned the fact that the delightful *coplas* of Castillejo entitled *Al Amor preso* is a paraphrase of Navagero's epigram, *De Cupidine et Hyella*, and that the last lines of Fernando's canción *Al Sueño*, are derived from a sonnet by the same poet. See *Antología de poetas líricos castellanos*, Madrid, 1908, Vol. XIII, p. 79. Estévan Manuel de Villegas also translated Navagero's epigram, *De Cupidine et Hyella*.

just as well regard the term 'French literature' as identical with the Code Napoléon. Nevertheless this so-called literature, together with what is left to-day of Frisian dialects and of Modern Frisian literature, enables us to trace the history of the Frisian language from the middle of the thirteenth century to the present time, and to arrive at certain conclusions as to its condition at an earlier period.

The Frisian language, in any case, would seem important enough to call for a widespread interest and a thorough study at least in the two foremost English-speaking countries. Actually, however, the study of Frisian has been utterly neglected both in England and in the United States. It is very characteristic that, e. g., Henry Sweet's admirable *Handbook of Phonetics* (Oxford, 1877) contains specimens—in phonetic transcription—of English, German, Dutch, Icelandic, Swedish, Danish, but none of Frisian.¹ To be sure, there appeared in 1879 W. T. Hewett's *The Frisian Language and its Literature* (Ithaca, N. Y.), and in 1881 J. A. Cummins's *A Grammar of the Old Frisian Language* (London, 2d ed., 1877). But the latter is hardly more than an adaptation of the corresponding sections in Heyne's *Laut- und Flexionslehre der altgermanischen Dialekte*, while Hewett's treatise was apparently intended as a popular account rather than as an original contribution to the study of Frisian. With these few exceptions, the English-speaking world has been satisfied to leave the linguistic work in Frisian to the Frisians and to German, Danish, and Dutch scholars. Under these circumstances it is gratifying to meet with the present contribution to the grammar of Modern West Frisian in the Publications of the Philological Society. This the more so as we learn from the preface that the President of that Society, Dr. Craigie, has personally interested himself in the publication and the revision of this work.

¹ In justice to the late philologist, however, it ought to be stated that in his treatise on "Dialects and prehistoric forms of Old English" in the Transactions of the Philological Society, London, 1877, p. 543 seq., he emphasized the importance of the study of Frisian in view of its relation to Anglo-Saxon.

There is every prospect that Mr. Sipma's grammar may become the standard grammar of Modern West Frisian, or that it will serve at least to prepare the way for a future more comprehensive grammatical work on Modern Frisian. A comparison with the current grammars of this language, especially with G. Colmjon's *Beknopte Friesche Spraakkunst voor den tegenwoordigen tijd* (Leeuwarden, 1863), which in a second edition appeared under the name of Ph. van Blom (Joure, 1889), will easily convince us how much a work like the present one was needed. Mr. Sipma above all, by giving an exact phonetic transcription of the West Frisian sounds, enables his readers to find out how the language is actually pronounced: a very essential matter in grammatical study, yet a matter which remains rather obscure in grammars like the *Beknopte Friesche Spraakkunst*, where the Frisian peculiarities are disguised under the current spelling, a spelling chiefly modelled after that of the Dutch language.

The necessity of using a phonetic spelling for the modern Frisian dialects was urged many years ago by Theodor Siebs, not only in his Frisian Grammar in Paul's *Grundriss* (to which Mr. Sipma refers in his Introduction, p. 5), but somewhat earlier in his work *Zur Geschichte der englisch-friesischen Sprache* (Halle, 1889). West Frisian words here are quoted by Siebs, not in the common spelling, but in a phonetic transcription. It stands to reason that in works concerned with Frisian in all of its various periods and all of its modern dialects, Professor Siebs could grant comparatively little space to Modern West Frisian. Yet there are instances in which Siebs is more complete than Sipma. The latter, e. g., quotes p. 74 (§ 249) the preterits *koe* and *scoe* without adding a phonetic transcription, while Siebs in Paul's *Grundriss I²*, pp. 1328 and 1330, states that these forms are pronounced *kûə* and *sûə*. In general Mr. Sipma has followed too little the example set by Grimm's Grammar of illustrating sounds and forms by an ample number of examples. His grammar, therefore, would seem to need as a supplement a West Frisian dictionary (much more complete than

the glossary found at the end of the present grammar) in phonetic transcription.

In transcribing the modern Frisian dialects Professor Siebs used more or less his own phonetic system, while Mr. Sipma has throughout employed the symbols of the International Phonetic Association. The advantage here, it seems to me, is not altogether on the side of the latter. The system of the International Phonetic Association has, to be sure, been widely spread by the works of P. Passy, W. Viëtor, and others. It is very doubtful, however, whether its general adoption, though recommended by many authorities, would be desirable. Perhaps this would mean a step backward in matters of phonetics: not only for the general reason that the adoption of a final, obligatory system precludes, or at least reduces, the possibility of additional improvements (a fact illustrated by most of the current systems of spelling), but especially because the system of the Internat. Phon. Ass. has several features in distinction from other phonetic systems which cannot be regarded as improvements. Among these I would reckon the fact that the stress is marked by an accent, not on the sonant element of the syllable (the "Silbenträger") which invariably bears the stress, but by an accent in front of the whole syllable. If this system were applied to Greek, we should have to spell, e. g., ἀκτυλος and καλος instead of δακτυλος and καλος. Our author accordingly, in his specimens of West Frisian, writes, e. g., 'naχt and om'klamøt instead of na'χt and omkla'møt.

There is another objection to using the International Alphabet for the ordinary phonetic transcription of individual languages like Frisian and, I would add, like German, French, or English. While it is not difficult to devise an exact phonetic alphabet and at the same time a simple alphabet, not very different from the current Latin or German alphabets, for an individual language, the attempt to use one and the same phonetic alphabet for several different languages, especially languages as different in their sounds as French, German, and English, will necessarily make such an alphabet clumsy and complicated. While for a single

language it is generally possible to get along with an alphabet consisting of simple signs, an international alphabet needs numerous dia-critical marks, letters turned upside down, defaced letters (e. g., an i deprived of its dot), and similar means which necessarily must interfere with the ready understanding of the alphabet. The International Alphabet in this respect shares the disadvantages of a general phonetic alphabet. I am by no means hostile to the attempts to devise such an alphabet in the interest of phonetics and general linguistics. I believe, on the contrary, that the construction of a general phonetic alphabet—be it after the plan, e. g., of Lepsius' standard alphabet or in the entirely different manner suggested by Professor Jespersen—belongs to the fundamental tasks of phonetic science. Nor do I object, from a phonetic point of view, to the International Alphabet. But it is necessary to distinguish here between the aim of the phonetician and that of the grammarian, or, in other words, between general and special, or historical, phonetics. To substitute a general or an international alphabet (in the sense of a general alphabet of limited scope) for an individual phonetic alphabet of a single language (e. g., in the transcription of texts, of specimens of dialects, etc.) means confusing the methods and aims of general linguistics with those of historical grammar. I must add, however, in justice to Mr. Sipma, that the misunderstanding to which he has fallen a victim is shared by many authorities on Phonetics and Modern Languages. His grammar, in spite of this deficiency, remains a work for which we have every reason to be grateful.

HERMANN COLLITZ.

Johns Hopkins University.

KARL VOSSLER, *Italienische Literatur der Gegenwart, von der Romantik zum Futurismus.*
Heidelberg, Winter, 1914. 8vo., 145 pp.

Some years ago Professor Vossler asked and answered the question: "Wie erklärt sich der späte Beginn der Vulgärliteratur in Italien?"

Now, at the other and ever moving limit of his field, he traces the course of Italian eloquence even unto *Cabiria* and the *gorgogliatore*.

His new book consists of a series of essays first given as lectures before the Freie Deutsche Hochstift in Frankfort. The authors studied at some length are Manzoni, Leopardi, Carducci, Fogazzaro, Verga, Ada Negri, De Amicis, Pascoli, d'Annunzio, and Croce. Briefer comment is accorded Guerrini, Gnoli, Serao, Di Giacomo, Belli, and Pascarella; others still are mentioned and dismissed with one or two epithets apiece.

Ada Negri, one would think, should hardly be classed with the writers of the first rank; and Gnoli and Pascarella might well have been consigned to the outer adjectival twilight. Some other men deserve more recognition than they receive,—notably Zanella, Nievo, De Sanctis, and Giacosa. Zanella is mentioned, to be sure, as the author of "feine, schwächliche Lyrik," but that is by no means the whole truth. Better than the *Conchiglia fossile* and the rest of his humanitarian verse are the late descriptive sonnets, Horatian again and again in their clear perfection; better yet the ringing patriotism of the ode to Cavour. And there are passages in *Milton e Galileo* that are worthy of Dante himself in their combination of profound thought and superb beauty.

Vossler's criticism is illuminating and judicious. It is the product of careful independent thinking, it is resolute, it is rich in verbal and figurative resource. Many qualities in books and men become the clearer for his delineation. His intellectual and moral standards are admirably high. He, like Fogazzaro,

sdegna il verso che suona e che non crea;

and the thing created, however vigorous, finds with him no mercy if its vigor is evil.

His moral severity is most welcome, particularly in its shattering of the commercialized aestheticism of d'Annunzio. One can but feel, however, that his intellectual severity leads him, at times, into some injustice. He demands from poet or novelist a much more complete philosophy than poet or novelist is, in the

general critical conception, required to possess; and his verdict, for those who do not measure to his rule, is tinged with a certain disdain. It is indeed far better to demand substantial thought than to consider form as paramount—far better to demand wealth of the Indies than to be content with the argosy's swift lines and flowing sail—but surely the poet's task is less the scientific organization of a rotund *Weltanschauung* than the moving, vital utterance of single truths. Leopardi did not attain to the logical system of Schopenhauer, but his *Canti* are none the less the supreme specific for the *katharsis* of pessimism. It may be granted that, in Vossler's sense, Carducci "kein Denker, sondern ein Dichter war"; but past speaks to present, through his verse, with the power that is born of wisdom. Fogazzaro never quite reconciled Darwin and Augustine; but he gave the best of his life to the prophecy of two eternal verities that would suffice, could they but strike home in the hearts of men, to make this earth a very different dwelling-place. The first is that religion, being conditioned by human intellect, is necessarily a changing thing; that beside its inmost, permanent truth it has at any time temporary habits of form and creed that are subject to renewal or rejection. The second is that Christianity should be an affair for laymen as well as priests, should be democratic and pervading, the inspiration and the prime motive of all social and political life.

Nor is Vossler quite fair in his account of the famous colloquy in *Il santo*. After mentioning Benedetto's four protests—against the *spirito di menzogna*, the *spirito di dominazione del clero*, the *spirito di avarizia* and the *spirito d'immobilità*—he continues: "Und welche Reformen schlägt er vor? Dass der Papst einen wahrheitsliebenden Mann zum Bischof machen und die Bücher eines modernistischen Religionsphilosophen nicht auf den Index setzen soll." Vossler implies that the four protests are subordinate and preliminary to the two petitions. In reality, each of the protests is in itself an eloquent plea for a great reform; the petitions are illustrative and incidental.

The essay on Fogazzaro, deficient, to my thinking, in these respects, is otherwise remark-

ably fine in its keen analysis and sure inference. It is the most detailed study in the book. Each of the seven novels is reviewed in content and in quality; the author's development is exactly traced from stage to stage; and his abilities and shortcomings are set forth in full light. Particularly good is the treatment of Fogazzaro's interacting lyricism and realism: the lyricism, more native and more essential, appears chiefly in the protagonists of his novels, creatures of his own mind and heart; realism determines the unsurpassed portraiture of the minor figures, drawn with humorous sympathy and wonderful deftness from the "little worlds" that Fogazzaro knew. As serious blemishes in his work there are noted, rightly, a certain mystic vagueness, and a "religiös parfümierte Lüsterneheit."

Carducci, Latin of the Latins, remains, to the northern critic, a foreigner. Excellent as it is in many passages—notably in the discussion of Carducci's scholarship—Vossler's essay on Carducci reveals an incomplete understanding of the poet's inspiration and achievement. Vossler regards patriotism as the essential impulse of Carducci's verse. Even deeper, I think, is a motive which Vossler does not mention: the celebration of normal life, the life of man bound by the moral bond to fellow man, a life healthy with labor and joyous with love. This motive clearly dominates several of the finest poems, as *La madre* and *Il canto dell'amore*, and it underlies many of the others.

Vossler's insensitivity in this regard narrows his service as interpreter. His treatment of *Il bove* is a case in point: "In dem wunderbaren, formvollendeten Sonett . . . ist kaum eine Regung des Gemütes mehr und fast nur noch Zeichnung, Farbe, Plastik zu spüren. Man fühlt sich in der Nähe der Eisgrenze, wo die Dichtung als darstellende Kunst zu sinnlichen Formen erstarrt." But *Il bove* is not merely an objective picture. Its true meaning is revealed in that first adjective, equally famous and misunderstood: "T' amo, o pio bove." Carducci employs *pio* again and again, throughout his work, to denote a willing consciousness of the moral bond between man and man,—as when he bids the sun illumine

non ozi e guerre a i tiranni,
ma la giustizia pia del lavoro.

With the significance of the word thus affirmed in his own mind, he uses it freely to denote relationships similar, in poetic fancy, to the human tie. So, in the sonnet to Virgil, the moon, as giver of consolation, becomes "la pia luna." And just so, in *Il bove*, the ox is called *pio* as a willing sharer in the normal life of man. That justifies the requiting "T' amo," and informs the lines

mite un sentimento
Di vigore e di pace al cor m' infondi

and

al giogo inchinandoti contento
L' agil opra de l' uom grave secondi:
Ei t' esorta e ti punge, e tu co 'l lento
Giro de' pazienti occhi rispondi.

That too is why the fields are called "free and fertile," why the lowing rises "like a happy hymn," and why the green silence of the plain is "divine." The *Eisgrenze* is very far away.

Carducci, we are told, devoted himself to the past primarily for the sake of escaping the present. But Carducci's avowed reason is very different: "The spaces of time under the Triumph of Death are infinitely more immense and more tranquil than the brief moment agitated by the phenomenon of life. Hence the imagination of the poet can there freely take its flight, while the appearances of the present, in their continual flux, do not allow the artistic faculty so to fix them as to be able to transform them into the ideal." Moreover, the past, for Carducci, lived in vital and serviceable relation to the present: witness the climax of the *Canto dell'amore*, wherein the historic elements of a wonderfully visualized Umbrian landscape unite in the cry:—

Salute, o genti umane affaticate!
Tutto trapassa e nulla può morir.
Noi troppo odiammo e sofferimmo. Amate.
Il mondo è bello e santo è l' avvenir.

The poems of the past are for the most part poems of heroism, and their light is the eternal glow of heroic fire, not the sunset glamor of a day bygone. To Vossler, however, even Carducci's heroism is suspect. It is necessarily meaningless and ineffective, he argues, because

there underlies it a "Naturreligion gemischt aus modernem Materialismus und Positivismus und antikem Epikureismus und Stoizismus." But heroes do not always stop to reason why.

Vossler finds it odd that in 1866 and 1870 Carducci did not celebrate Napoleon III or the King of Prussia; rather is it odd that he finds it odd. He asks why Jesus, Paul, and Augustine are not classed in the *Satana* with Savonarola and Luther. The answer is that Carducci's *daimon*, bent on the assertion of self, abhors self-sacrifice. Too much is made of the influence of German romanticism on Carducci. That influence is clear in such inferior work as the *Anacreontica romantica*, but it is hardly to be discerned in any of the later and finer verse. One must dissent, moreover, from the parting verdict that the poetry of Carducci may be "in aller Welt geachtet und bewundert, aber doch nur in Italien erlebt und geliebt." It has already won love and entered into life far beyond the Alpine barrier.

There are several minor misstatements in the pages on Carducci. He translated not "manche Perlen altfranzösischer und spanischer Liederkunst," but just one Old French and just two Spanish poems. It was not an actual beef-steak but an imaginary pork chop that got him into trouble at San Miniato. His appointment at Bologna did not follow immediately upon his private teaching in Florence: there intervened a period of service at the Liceo of Pistoia. His university work did not continue until his death, but ended with his resignation in 1904.

The treatment of Leopardi, so far as it goes, is sound; the causes and character of his pessimism are set forth as clearly as one could desire. But the half, and the better half, is left untold: the passionate striving of Leopardi's poet-heart to withstand the arguments of his relentless mind; the passionate clinging to the old ideals of beauty and love. Nor is the quality of his verse, essentially classic in its resolute finality, adequately characterized in such terms as these: "die sanften, innigen, müden Harmonien; süsser schmelzender Gesang, so weich und doch nicht süßlich, so schmachtend und keusch; voll hingebender Stimmung; schmiegsamer wiegender Traum."

The quotation and the rendering of the first lines of *Amore e morte* are slightly incorrect: the punctuation is so altered as to injure sense and syntax, and the translation is faithful to the fault. The title *Pensieri* belongs to the selection of a hundred *pensées* published by Ranieri: Vossler uses it with reference to the seven-volume mass of notes called officially *Pensieri di varia filosofia e di bella letteratura*, and properly referred to, when brevity is desired, as the *Zibaldone*.

The other essays are uniformly excellent. They contain many fine statements of commonly accepted opinion, and many judgments that bring initial challenge and ultimate acquiescence. This passage, from the essay on Pascoli, is quite typical in thought and expression:

Und so ist ihm die ganze Welt: ein Irrgarten von Geheimnis und eine Blumenwiese von Kostbarkeiten, eine grosse dunkle Allegorie und eine niedliche Kleinwelt. Und im Grössten liegt das Kleinste, im Kleinsten das Unendliche geschlossen. Aber keine Stufenfolge, keine Ordnung führt vom einen zum andern. Traumhaft ist alles durcheinandergeschlungen. Niemand kommt der Wirklichkeit näher als der Träumende. Wer im Traum zu weinen weiß, hat die Vollendung erreicht:

Chi piange in sogno, è giunto a ciò che vuole.

Very notable, too, are the pages on Verga and Italian realism, the demolition of d'Annunzio, and the careful report of the critical doctrine of Croce.

To Croce's admirable essays on modern Italian literature (just now reissued in book form) Vossler gladly acknowledges his indebtedness. But Vossler's borrowing, in its judicial independence and its re-creative power, reveals a critical faculty not inferior to that of Croce. Vossler builds, moreover, on the surer basis; for whereas Croce holds to a theory of expressional satisfaction, Vossler proceeds from the belief that literature is of and is for the whole inner man—heart, mind, and will. Croce's actual criticism, broader than his theory, displays and applies a varied wealth of human interest; Vossler's criticism is worthy both of his Italian model and his own creed.

ERNEST H. WILKINS.

The University of Chicago.

Three Plays by Friedrich Hebbel. Introduction by L. H. ALLEN. Everyman's Library, 1914.

This translation is one of the various signs that the indifference of the English-reading public to Hebbel is at last giving way, and as such, as well as for its own sake, should be heartily welcome. It contains three plays, two translated by Mr. Allen of Sidney, N. S. W., the third, *Maria Magdalena*, by Barber Fairley.

Mr. Allen, with whom I am chiefly concerned here, chose *Herodes und Mariamne* and *Gyges und sein Ring*, which may be considered fortunate selections. He has attempted the difficult task of turning them into English blank verse, being guided, as he himself tells us in his Introduction, by the distinctive rhythm of the original, as far as he was able to attain this. Without going further into this feature of the translation, I will merely say that he seems to me to have succeeded well in his effort. It must be particularly difficult to translate Hebbel, both on account of the individuality of his single expressions, and the general complex movement of his larger groups. The peculiar inflexibility, expressed in his language no less than in his characters, the presence of beauty won from a conflict, the sense of depth, passion, and force, restrained but always there—such things belong to the atmosphere of his language, and can be found in no dictionary. It is in this phase of translating that Mr. Allen is well equipped. His work has little of mere routine about it. The amount of energy he has expended in finding adequate renderings is astonishing. His translation might pass for an original production in English. Conscientious interpretation of the text, according to the spirit, seems to have been his principle throughout. A few examples follow.

In the well-known lines where Kandaules, comparing skilful Greek with rough Lydian, speaks of the Greek influence as a net, cunningly woven but easy to break, he adds:

Und geh'n zu uns'rem eignen Spass hinein:
Ein kleiner Ruck macht uns ja wieder frei.
(ll. 111-12.)

The translation has:

And with a covert laugh we bungle in
Because a tiny fin-flick sets us free.

And these lines, all from *Gyges*, with translations immediately succeeding:

Dich hüten will ich, wie die treue Wimper
Dein Auge hütet. (ll. 1002-3.)

I will watch o'er you as the trusty lashes
Watch o'er your eye.

Und in dem falben Strahl der Abendsonne,
Der durch die Ritzen des Gemüuers drang,
Sah ich ein Wölkchen blassen Staubes schweben.
(ll. 168-70.)

And in the sickly shaft of westering sunlight
That pierced a passage through the chinked wall
I saw a wisp of pallid dust was swaying.

That fine line where Gyges explains his determination not to become visible in the Queen's chamber as coming from his desire to spare her

Die ewige Umschattung ihres Seins,

is translated by

The eternal crypt of shadow round her being.

And these lines from *Herod and Mariamne*:

Ein Sklav' stand hinter ihm, das Ohr gespitzt,
Die Tafel und den Griffel in der Hand,
Und zeichnete mit lächerlichem Ernst
Das auf, was ihm in trunk'nem Mut entfiel.
(ll. 163-66.)

A slave behind him with his ear acock,
A tablet and a stylus in his hand,
Was setting down—absurdly solemn owl!
Whatever crank escaped his tippler mood.

Not only is it difficult to translate Hebbel, it is not always easy to understand him. In respect of accuracy the translation deserves praise. Of Mr. Allen's work the *Gyges* seems to be better in this quality than the *Herod*. Only two or three errors came to my attention in the former, but more in the latter. Some of them follow.

Mariamne in explaining the envy of the weak for the strong (p. 103) says:

What has the slave for solace when the king
In gorgeousness and glory sweeps him by
Than this—to say, “He gets his turn like me!
I grudge it not! And when he mounts his throne
Fresh from a field o'erstrown with graves in
thousands
I'll praise him for't: it chokes his covetous
mood!”

Here the quotation marks, lacking in Hebbel, should end with “He gets his turn like me!” The next words are Mariamne's own, and “he” refers not to “king” but to “slave.” The word translated “mount” is “*rücken an*,” which could not mean that. It here means to “put” or “place,” and the whole passage means: “If he (the slave) places the battle-field with its thousands of graves right next to the throne, I approve it, for that chokes his envy.” (Cf. ll. 1095 ff.)

The deed I must accomplish,
And that on both, or else endure them both.
(p. 106.)

This should read: “The deed I must accomplish, and that on both, or else suffer it.” The word rendered by “them” is “*sie*,” and it refers to *Tat* of the line before. The speaker, Joseph, must either kill both Mariamne and Alexandra or be killed by them. (Cf. ll. 1183 ff.)

A somewhat difficult passage (p. 110), in which Mariamne reads the thoughts of Joseph from the expression of his face, seems to have been misunderstood, at least if we are to judge from one of its crucial lines:

Dann hätte ich an einen kalten Gruss
Mich nie gekehrt—
I had not turned me with a cold good-bye.

It is not quite clear what the English means. The German is plain. Mariamne says that Joseph is thinking: “I should not have worried about a cold greeting.” That is, if Joseph had known that Mariamne would take her own life anyway, granting Herod's death, he would not have feared her and worried about her unkind treatment of him. (Cf. ll. 1289 ff.)

In her final conversation with Titus, Mariamne explains the necessity of her action in these words:

Wenn nichts als Trotz mich trieb, wie er meint,
Der Schmerz der Unschuld hätt' den Trotz ge-
brochen:
Jetzt machte er nur bitterer mir den Tod.

Mr. Allen translates:

Naught but defiance drives me as he thinks;
If so my guiltless smart had broke defiance
And now 'twould mean a bitterer death.

The last two lines have been misunderstood. “*Der Schmerz der Unschuld*”—“the pain of innocence”—refers to the pain of her children in the everlasting farewell mentioned in the line before. The context shows that, and if there were any doubt at all, the variant reading given by Werner would dispel it. The line first read: “*Der Kinder Unschuld hätt' ihn schnell ge- brochen.*” The last line quoted from the translation should accordingly be: “Now it only made my death more bitter.” (Cf. ll. 3090 ff.)

Herod, speaking to Joab, says:

Was Moses bloss gebot, um vor dem Rückfall
In seinen Kälberdienst dies Volk zu schützen,
Wenn er kein Narr war, das befolgt dies Volk,
Als hätt' es einen Zweck an sich—

The translation is correct here except for the rendering of the words, very characteristic of Herod, “wenn er kein Narr war.” Mr. Allen says, “though *he* was no fool.” He gave himself unnecessary trouble with the conjunction, for the expression simply means, “if he was no fool.” The sense of the passage is, that Moses, unless he was a fool, gave the Jews his precepts not as an end in themselves, but to protect them from idolatry. (Cf. ll. 149 ff.)

I will mention only one other passage in full. This consists of two lines from the Appendix, where certain passages from earlier versions are given. The lines formerly came after l. 828:

Es wär' genug den Cäsar zu bezahlen
Und schätzt er selbst sich ab vorm Tode.

The “schätzt” here is an error of the translator for “*schätz'*,” though this does not seem to have influenced his interpretation of the lines. Mr. Allen says in his note: “The words seem to mean ‘The tribute would be enough to pay Caesar if he (Herod) were assenting to his own value to save himself from death.’ The passage proved too much for me,

and I owe this explanation to Mr. Nicholson. I translate:

It were enough to quit his debt to Caesar
Were he himself to rate his worth 'gainst death."

This translation is plainly not correct. It is neither very plausible in itself nor does it square with the German. Again Werner gives a suggestion, showing a variant reading of the second line to have been: "Und schätzt' ihn seine eigne Waffe ab!" Werner conjectures that *Waffe* may have been *Wage*. That conjecture fits what seems to be the natural meaning of the two lines under discussion. Sameas, who is trying to give a vivid picture of the richness of Herod's tribute to Rome, says: "It would be enough to pay for Caesar, at Caesar's own valuation before his death." "Before his death" is added as a further, too fine, pointing of a not particularly happy thought.

Besides the passages mentioned, I have, without making a line-for-line comparison, noticed slight errors in the following places: ll. 509, 740, 925, 1518, 1630-32, 1910, 2998, and, I believe, 2256. There are not enough inaccuracies seriously to impair the value of the work. All in all, the English reader may approach these translations with confidence, sure of finding not only the words and thought, but the atmosphere and character of the original.

The translation of *Maria Magdalena* is done in vigorous and idiomatic prose, and, so far as I observed, with a very high degree of accuracy. Mr. Allen's Introduction to the volume furnishes a brief but admirable survey of Hebbel's personality and work.

T. M. CAMPBELL.

Randolph-Macon Woman's College.

Elementary French Grammar (Grammaire Française Élémentaire). By EVERETT WARD OLMSTED. New York, Holt and Company [1915]. Pp. iii-v, Preface; pp. 1-217, forty-three "Lessons"; pp. 219-338, tables of verbs, four pp. of phonetic transcriptions, two vocabularies, and an index.

From Mr. Olmsted's Preface: [1] "The aim of this book is to offer a thorough and practical

course in French that shall combine the best features of both the so-called 'grammatical' and 'direct' methods of instruction." . . . [2] "Every lesson contains a reading exercise of connected prose. These exercises present topics of general, practical interest in the early part of the book, and in the latter part are devoted more particularly to French life and culture [a distinction which this reviewer fails to grasp]. The aim has been to introduce a thoroughly French atmosphere, and such subjects as the arrival in Paris, the choice of an apartment, sight-seeing in Paris, the history of the city, French education, Parisian theaters and cafés, etc. [cf. *Le Petit Parisien*], have been chosen with that end in view. Some of the information given may be of value to future travelers." (Here attention is called to "an exceedingly brief, but useful résumé of French literature" in lessons XXXVIII-XL.) [3] "If used with judgment, this grammar is appropriate to all sorts of beginners, those in the high-schools as well as those in the colleges. However, in those preparatory schools where the teacher may prefer to begin with a *very elementary method*, this grammar will be found ideal for the review work of the second year." Then [4]: "The introduction contains the most complete presentation of the phonetic symbols to be found in any similar text-book, and many teachers will welcome this aid." (Mr. O. explicitly acknowledges indebtedness to Brachet and Dussouchet, and to Fraser and Squair's larger *French Grammar*.)

GENERALITIES

To consider a typical "lesson," Mr. O. gives a Vocabulary, states a few principles of syntax, inserts a Reading Exercise (usually of his own composing), a Grammatical Drill, a Conversation, Composition (English to French), and an Oral Exercise (in English). The sentences to be translated are brief, for the most part simple, generally relevant, and seldom of the Ollendorffian sort or otherwise too characteristic of "grammars." I say "seldom" because occasionally (perhaps purposely) Mr. O. writes very French-like English and sometimes he inserts sentences which leave a good deal to be desired from various points of view.

For example: P. 51: ". . . qui commence par ('by') une voyelle" . . . P. 74: "le pantalon . . . the pantaloons." P. 87: "The interesting little blue book on his desk

is our French grammar." P. 108 (grammatical note): "Le is often used pleonastically [an error] in the predicate," etc.; then: "Etes-vous heureuse?—Je le suis. Etes-vous mère?—Je le suis." Such examples of "pleonastic" *le* occur only in grammars. § 251: "There are only two irregular verbs in -er, aller and envoyer." Mr. O. does not define "regular" and "irregular"; but, if by "irregular verb" we understand *any verb showing non-negligible variations in its stem, and having all the inflectional endings of*, say, *parler*, there are hundreds of irregular verbs in -er, some of which raise serious difficulties. P. 137: "Dites-moi de deux façons différentes 'French is an easy subject.'" Of course one is free to say almost anything in the "exercises" of a grammar; but is not this precisely one of those things that should not be said? The average student *thinks* this in many different ways, whether after two or three years of study he is still unable to express any independent series of thoughts in passably correct French or not. Why should any class be thus tempted to perpetuate this harmful delusion? Why not take, instead, the point of view of Philip Gilbert Hamerton, who, to this very statement would have us reply: "Sir, can you write and speak French correctly?" Limited though it be in its scope, and lightly though it deals with everyday difficulties, Mr. O.'s book itself abundantly indicates that French is not "an easy subject."

On page 114 we meet "*éclairer*, to lighten;" p. 116, "I am afraid when it lightens," and in both Mr. O.'s final vocabularies *éclairer* and "to lighten" are thus defined. P. 124: "Dans quel bateau est-ce que j'ai fait mon premier voyage en Europe?" Of large craft, *sur* is the correct preposition, and is in fact used by Mr. O. in this connection on p. 123. P. 153: "Qu'y a-t-il que vous n'avez pas encore vu à Paris?" Very dubious; likewise: "Donnez-moi un verbe en -ter qui est une exception à la règle" (p. 118). P. 204: "J'y irai, à moins qu'il n'y aille," etc. From these examples I pass to another kind:

Page 159: "The Parisians are always in search of pleasure [think of them now], while the people of New York think of nothing but

their business." Why avail oneself of *grammatical* license, if I may so alter the usual phrase, to perpetuate this hackneyed misobservation, never true and so conspicuously, so sadly untrue at the present time? In "an exceedingly brief, but useful résumé of French literature" (pp. 190–201, *passim*) Mr. O. twice calls the *Roman de Renart*, "qui date du XIII^e siècle," "le *Roman du Renart*," and translates in a footnote "Romance of the Fox." (See also p. 191.) We are told, furthermore, that "les mystères, les moralités, les farces, [Fr. usage forbids this comma] et les soties [datent] du XV^e siècle"—also largely an error—and in a footnote the masterpiece of the farces is referred to as "*La Farce de l'avocat Pathelin*." *Maistre Pierre Pathelin* is the oldest known, therefore, presumably, the correct title; what Mr. O. gives can refer properly only to the so-called comedy by Brueys and Palaprat (1706). *Me judice*, this summary not only requires correction, but would require more length and more depth to make it really "useful."

As to general method. Let us be glad that Mr. O. presents principles systematically, for the so-called "natural method" does not correspond to nature and, if used exclusively in our ordinary class-rooms, remains a chaos and produces chaotic results. To set over each lesson a formal Vocabulary, a practice generally followed, seems to me a mistake; for this process isolates words that might easily be given (or others just as useful) in a continuous passage, and with some assured meaning. In either case translation is required, and continuity not only gives each word a natural existence but allows its sound to be more accurately transcribed. The passages for translation (already mentioned) are for the most part interesting and will enable competent teachers to develop a great many points that Mr. O. has probably felt obliged to pass rapidly or in silence. The material for translation into French seems to me particularly good, and let me mention as one of the most felicitous the exercise bearing on reflexive constructions, pp. 105–106.

PHONETICS

Mr. O.'s prefatory claim is correct, so far as I am aware, but several features demand atten-

tion. P. 4: "The phonetic symbols employed in this grammar are those of the International Phonetic Association." Throughout his book, Mr. O. uses *g* to symbolize the voiced explosive of words such as *gant* (instead of the modified form of the letter *g* which constitutes the regular phonetic symbol), and he appears to let *r* represent a uvular *r* [R]. His transcriptions, with the exception of those on pp. 241-244, seldom represent anything but isolated words, including the infinitives of extremely variable verbs. And why, upon arriving at "Orthographical Changes" (p. 117), does Mr. O. return to the old chaos?—"Verbs in *-cer*, to preserve the soft *c* of the infinitive throughout their conjugation, add a cedilla whenever *c* precedes *a* or *o*." And "Verbs in *-ger*, to preserve the soft *g* of the infinitive, insert an *e* after *g* before *a* or *o*."

What Mr. O. calls a "soft *c*" (i. e., a voiceless *s*) is regarded by most musicians as a very *hard* and disagreeable noise, and is not described as a "soft *c*" by any recognized phonetician. On p. 118 the student is asked: "Que fait-on pour conserver au *c* et au *g* le son doux qu'ils ont dans *placer, manger?*" Let our author consult the *Dictionnaire Général*, under *Cédille*, and he will find: "Petit signe . . . qui, placé sous un *c* suivi des voyelles *a, o, ou u*, indique qu'il doit être prononcé avec le son de l's forte." Add to this that [s] is popularly known in France as "l's dure."

MORPHOLOGY, SYNTAX, AND THE RULES BEARING THEREON

Many of the "essentials" of French morphology and syntax can be stated with brevity, simplicity, and accuracy. Most of Mr. O.'s tables, lists, rules, etc., prove this; but when Mr. O. avers that "Enough grammar is given to enable the student to understand *thoroughly* [italics mine], upon the completion of the book, ordinary French construction" (Preface, p. iii) he is either very much in error or "ordinary" does not mean to him what it means to me, for example. There are hundreds of constructions in everyday use, both in normal speech and in normal books, many of them quite as "ordinary" as what Mr. O. has happened to deal

with, some of them still more "ordinary," which Mr. O. has not even mentioned, and his "thoroughly" is something to make one pensive. I venture to say that it is perhaps a greater mistake to imbue students with the notion that "French is an easy subject," something of which the essentials can be learned "thoroughly" in forty or fifty lessons, no matter how good, than to dwell too often on its innumerable difficulties, demonstrated to exist by almost every batch of examination papers turned in by almost any high-school or undergraduate class. The unavoidable necessity of being brief prevents me from dealing, save as I do, with what Mr. O. has left out; I can touch upon some of the things he has put in.

P. 42: "*des petits pains*" and "*des jeunes gens*" are classed with "*Je bois du bon vin*," with the statement that "This usage is not considered incorrect." Thus "*du bon vin*" is made to figure as "a sort of compound noun." P. 53: "*Il m'a déchiré le gilet.*" See Clédat, *Gram. rais.*, p. 141, note 1. Pp. 54 ff.: Throughout, Mr. O. uses the conventional names Present, Imperfect, Past Definite, Past Anterior, etc., and in so doing he agrees with almost all grammarians. In my opinion, most of these names are so frequently misnomers that it is a pity to use any of them, except when they apply accurately to a given case. If a given group of verb forms (say, *je parle*, etc.) can have two or more tense-values, obviously *no* supposedly defining name for such a group can be universally correct. That it is possible to avoid this confusing of forms and functions I shall show elsewhere (in my own glass house!, if such it is to be); let me say now that it seems to me obviously infelicitous to state that "The Past Indefinite or Perfect [see report of Committee on Nomenclature] . . . is the regular *tense* [italics mine] used in conversation to express definite past action" (§ 94). To call the "*j'ai vu*" of "*J'ai vu votre frère ce matin*" (§ 140) "the past indefinite" is like speaking of wooden tombstones and of glass corks. Again (§ 140), "The past definite, or preterit, is used to express a definite past action (*not a state or condition*) [italics mine] of long or short duration, provided the idea of action and

not of duration is emphasized." Need I quote?

Quand il mourut d'un eezéma,
Il exigea qu'on le crémât,
Et sur son urne un symboliste
Ecrivit ces mots: " Il fut triste!"

(Maurice Donnay, *Adolphe ou le jeune homme triste*.)

Exceptional, this? Not in the least, in *literature*; and it is worth noting that Mr. O. disobeys his own rule, quite properly! See, e. g., pp. 169, 174.

§ 133 (on the "imperfect indicative," also "descriptive past tense") falls far short of defining the simpler or most usual functions of the forms in *-ais*, which often refer to the present or the future, occasionally express a past conditional, and often express instantaneous action, etc.

§ 164, Note 2: "Most adjectives (other than proper adjectives or past participial adjectives) may *at times* [italics mine] be brought before the noun for the sake of emphasis, especially when following the definite article." Is this usable information? § 184: "The use of the imperfect subjunctive [frequently a misnomer], especially of the forms in *-asse*, is decreasing. [In literature, or in normal speech? Here, and generally elsewhere, Mr. O. does not distinguish between archaic and living French.] A past tense in the principal clause regularly requires it [by no means!], but the present subjunctive is generally used in all other cases." (Here a reference to § 342.) The fact, painful though it may be, is that *all* forms of the "past subjunctive" are dead in conversational usage, though in Zola and other equally close observers of nature very simple untutored folk often indulge in an *-asse*, an *-usse*, or an *-isse* (splendid documentary evidence for philologists!). § 340: "While the Indicative expresses certainty or fact, the Subjunctive expresses doubt, desirability, requirement, emotion, purpose, concession, etc." Si c'était vrai! and is it wise, anyhow, to put so many different things under one heading? If I were to be one of the many students who will use this book, and my teacher asked me: "Lequel des deux modes, l'indicatif ou le subjonctif, exprime le doute?" (p. 189), my answer, *dussé-je être*

obligé (cf. p. 207, bottom) *de subir la peine de mort*, would be: "Tous les deux"; and if he had taught me to say, e. g., "Je suis heureux que vous fussiez là" (§ 342), and if some day I should innocently spring this on some unoffending Frenchman, and he looked "edified," or disturbed, I should wish—what should I wish?

CONCLUSION

The rather large number of points on which it has been necessary to disagree with Mr. Olmsted does not include all that unquestionably call for correction. (See "Additional Details.") On the other hand, I think the verdict of many examiners of Mr. Olmsted's book may be that it is the best book of its scope available, well proportioned, orderly, simple, and interesting; and perhaps many persons will agree with me in my belief that this edition can be greatly improved when numerous teachers, including its author, have had a chance to see how it *works*. Above all things, let the study of French be treated as something that cannot be done well *par-dessous la jambe*.

ADDITIONAL DETAILS

Everywhere "A." What authority?—P. 41: "The United States are . . ."—P. 43: "There were nothing but . . ."—P. 92: For "waiting" read "awaiting."—P. 96 and *passim*: "la synopsis" (?).—P. 105: "In the plural, such verbs [as *se flatter*] often have a reciprocal force." It is the pronoun, not the verb, that has this force, or it is the group. Again, p. 117, it is not *être* and *avoir* that are impersonal, but the *il* that goes with them. There are almost no impersonal verbs in M. F. (Ex. *Soit!* or *Faut voir.*)—§ 234 is really an inadequate note.—§ 244 (f. n.). What is "this case"?—§ 245. Read "negative is used."—§ 252. Add *vas-y*.—§§ 256–257. Mr. O. forgets, e. g., *ceux-là même qui*.—§ 259. "Ceci and *cela* may be used in all constructions, usually without reference to a definite antecedent." Then *Cela est mon ami*, and worse, would be correct.—§ 260. *Ça parle trop* is not well translated.—P. 133 (bottom). "This is the number, isn't it?" How to be translated?—§ 264. Rule is incorrect; Note 1 has no utility; Note 3 makes a mere trifle of what is an important "ordinary" fact.—P. 137: "Chaise à bascule."

The expression is even rarer than the thing, usually called *un rocking*.—P. 143: “Quelle sorte d'après-midi avez-vous eu . . . ?” (?).—Also: “Quelle avenue vous a-t-il fallu suivre . . . ?” (?).—P. 147 (Note): “The conditional *saurais*, etc., is often used to translate the English ‘can’ (*in the sense of* ‘would know how’).” Better ‘should’ (cf. comments on §§ 350 and 360), and anyhow, rather: ‘I really couldn’t . . .’ (*Always ne saurais*.) Cf. (p. 149): “In fact, I cannot (*trans.* ‘would not know how to’).” Again, “would” for ‘should.’—P. 149. “(merveilles, m. pl.)”—§ 288. Inadequate.—§ 291. No fem. for several forms.—§§ 291–299. Important subject, very inadequate treatment.—§ 311. Pronunciation of various cardinal numerals inadequately represented, and “[vɛt dø]” is incorrect.—§ 312. For “words” read ‘nouns,’ and insert *cent hommes* to exemplify that *t* “is silent also in *cent*” (!).—§ 315. “The form *mil* is often used in dates.” Then, as an example: “*en mil huit cent quatorze*”—not living French. On *l'an mille*, see Clédat, *G. r.*, § 261.—§ 321. Note 2, on *deuxième* and *second*, not justified by usage.—§ 323. *leçon un* would have been more instructive than Mr. O.’s “*leçon trois*.”—§ 331: “‘To’ before an infinitive is often omitted in French. It is sometimes expressed by *de*, *à*, or *pour*.” Is this either felicitous or useful?—§ 334. *aimer* requires comment.—§ 336. “purpose” is inadequate; see § 335.—§ 337: “All prepositions govern the infinitive, except *en*, which requires the present participle.” Read ‘gerund’; but when do *après*, *avant*, *avec*, *contre*, *derrière*, *devant*, *entre*, *par*, etc., etc., govern an infinitive? Further: “*Après* governs the perfect infinitive.” Insert ‘only’; but note (?) *après boire*—§ 343, *croindre*, perhaps rightly, figures as an “irregular verb.” Then why not *vendre*? (§ 116).—P. 191, line “11”: “were they miracle-plays or mysteries,” . . . Is this English? or merely intended to call for a Fr. subjunctive?—P. 195, line “17.” Omit “*en*.”—P. 198. Why “*quant* (*à*)”?—§ 350. Read ‘I should like a dog, to guard the house.’—§ 351: “*C'est la première chose qu'elle a dite*.” Not a clear example.—§ 352 (Note 1). Add ‘when there is no adverbial complement and when the infinitive is not stressed.’—P. 201, lines 10–11. Not the more natural construction, and *tiennent* is a concealed subjunctive. Concealed subjunctives should be avoided in exemplifying the subjunctive. In line 14 “*Quelque scientifique que soit* . . .” exemplifies purely literary usage. Let living French be learned first! In line 24 Zola figures as a

“réaliste.” Did Zola not call himself a “naturaliste”?—P. 205. “Speak louder, that I may hear you.” Not living English.—P. 205 (f. n.): “*Se mettre* = ‘to put on’” (Cf. my comment on P. 208, top). Why and when?—P. 207 (Conversation). An extremely unlikely achievement, unless the whole class attempts to learn the passage from Molière by heart.—P. 207 (near bottom). Is the student expected to say “*Dussé-je être obligé de* . . .”?—P. 208 (top). Is the student expected to say *Je me suis mis des pantoufles* or the like? See comment on p. 205, f. n.—§ 359. Hasty.—§ 360. Of course, but *avoir besoin de* is not a “verb.” For “will” read ‘shall.’—§ 363. For “Some” read ‘Hundreds’; then read ‘take prepositions different from . . .’—P. 211 (top). For “example” read ‘exemple.’ Sentence 9. Apparently, the student is expected to translate “Depend upon me” with a *Dépendez de moi*. The Vocab. indicates *dépendre de* for this.—P. 211, line “10.” For “*à*” read ‘*à*.’—§ 366: “A collective noun regularly takes a singular verb.” How about *la foule*, *le nombre*, *la plupart*, etc.?—§ 368. For “[rezudr]” read ‘[rezu:dr].’ As usual, no pronunciation is indicated except for the infinitive.—P. 219 (Part II): “The *t* of this ending [vend] is missing, . . .” What has become of it?—§ 400. *j'ai ouï dire* corresponds to ‘I’ve heard say (tell)’ rather than to “I have heard said.”

RICHARD T. HOLBROOK.

Bryn Mawr College.

The Old Norse Element in Swedish Romanticism. By ADOLPH BURNETT BENSON. (Columbia University Germanic Studies.) New York, Columbia University Press, 1914. 8vo., xii + 192 pp., \$1.

Of recent contributions to the history of Swedish literature, by far the most important is this admirably clear and lucid exposition of the so-called Gothic elements in Swedish Romanticism. The work is, on the whole, remarkably clear, succinct and interest-holding. The thesis involved is well developed, the argument advances step by step with increasing conviction.

tion, so that one is impressed by the fact that Dr. Benson not only has driven home his point but has done it in a delightful way.

The chief merit of the work consists in the exposition of the Gothic tendencies of the Fosforists themselves. The close connection of the Fosforists with the German Romantic School has led to the misconceived notion that there was, upon their part, no independent activity (as was the case with the Goths) in connection with their ideals of Scandinavian antiquity, and that this element did not constitute any important phase of their literary propaganda. Dr. Benson clearly shows that, in spite of the hostile attitude of these two Schools toward each other, this distinction is chiefly traditional and without intrinsic value. In fact, the Fosforists' interest in Gothic material has been heretofore either ignored, treated superficially, or actually misrepresented.

The author prepares the way for his argument by reviewing the beginnings of interest in Old Norse subjects during the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries in Sweden. This introduction is based upon the most recent and thorough investigation of the Gothic movement in the North which we possess: Anton Blanck, *Den nordiska Renässansen i Sjuttonhundratalets Litteratur*, Stockholm, 1911. The following chapters, in which Dr. Benson develops the Gothic tendencies upon the part of the Fosforists and traces the interest in Old Norse themes through every phase of the Romantic Movement in Sweden, constitute a worthy supplement to Blanck's scholarly work.

The author's exposition of the attitude towards Scandinavian antiquity upon the part of the celebrated Fosforists, Atterbom, Hammar-skjöld and Livijn is very convincing, and the exceptionally clear analysis of their principal works lends much to his argument. The interest of the Fosforists in Gothic material cannot be denied. For instance, the activity and erudition of Atterbom in Old Norse subjects was truly amazing; in fact, he knew more about the sagas than most Goths. Yet the foundation of all this was laid while he was still a militant Fosforist. Dr. Benson proves here the falsity of the unqualified statement that the

historical "revival in Swedish culture was given by the *Gothic Förbund*" (Vedel, *Svensk Romantik*, p. 251). Not only this, but the contribution of the Fosforists to Swedish literature in general is of much higher merit than critics have been wont to concede. So Atterbom was a poet of really high rank and, though he was not a creative artist, hardly any Goth surpassed him in the appreciation and interpretation of Old Norse subjects.

Even outside of strictly Romantic circles the spirit of the age was pro-Gothic. The Swedish Academy itself was not opposed to literary creations with Old Norse content, provided they measured up to the traditional standards of form and style. Granberg's *Jorund* and Charlotta d'Albedyhl's *Gefion* (especially the latter) illustrate exceedingly well how deeply the Gothic tendency had become rooted outside Gothic circles; in fact *Gefion* was probably written before the Gothic Society was founded. The authoress' conception of the viking age is typically Gothic in that she implies that the modern era is corrupt by stating that the mythological age was incorrupt, which is the same Rousseauish spirit that permeated the minds of all the Goths.

The question, agitated by the Swedish Romanticists, as to the introduction of Northern mythology into art is the subject of one of the most interesting chapters in Dr. Benson's work. He shows clearly that in art, as well as in literature, the difference between Goth and Fosforist was merely relative. Even the Goths (cf. especially Geijer) recognized the tendency towards exaggeration in the representation of Old Norse divinities in the plastic arts and expressed apprehension concerning it. But the satires leveled against the Goths in this regard included the Fosforists as well, and were often in reality satires on the whole Romantic group. In fact, the Academician chief, Leopold, attacked this tendency in a poem and the anti-Fosforistic Malmström admits that it was common to both Fosforist and Goth. Furthermore, Dr. Benson shows that the exaggeration and crudity, of which the Gothic Ling, for instance, was accused (cf. Geijer, *Iduna*, 1817), were much overdrawn. Ling's views upon art

agreed essentially with those of Tegnér, who certainly offered the best solution of the problem.

The position of the young poet Stagnelius with reference to the Romantic Movement is attractively presented in the next chapter. In Stagnelius the Gothic element is beautifully blended with the grace of Hellenic culture. The myths of Odin, the *Bragaraður*, etc., form a background that is harmoniously blended with the poet's modern reflections and feelings. Yet Stagnelius was not formally allied with any literary school. It is to be regretted that the author has not laid more emphasis upon Tegnér's poetic activity in Gothic themes, for it is worthy of note that these two poets, one in dramatic, the other in lyrical productions, showed a marked similarity to each other, both in their general attitude towards Gothic themes and in the peculiar temper of their poetic genius. Both were steeped in the spirit of Hellenic culture, both were distinctly individual and independent, both were by nature hypochondriacal and given to 'Weltschmerz,' and both infused into their creations the largest significance of art and life. The deeper meaning of myth and religion, the constant strife between spirit and matter, sensuous coloring, and love of the beautiful were marked characteristics of Tegnér as well as of Stagnelius. The divinity of man was a theme which the priest Tegnér (Stagnelius' father was also a priest) constantly emphasized (cf. *Försoningen* in the *Frithiofssaga*, *Fridsröster*, *Nattvardsbarnen*, etc.), and it is particularly this theme which elevates the Old Norse myth in Stagnelius' *Gunlög* to a universal significance, for beneath its external crudeness it is the divine ownership of poetry which constitutes the inner meaning of the work; a theme which was especially suited to the Romantic temperament. Tegnér, too, held the idealized conception of poetry; that poetry was the highest type of religion and synonymous with life itself. "I really lived only when I sang," he said in his touching poem *Afsked till min lyra*. It is exactly this exalted concept which Stagnelius infused into the primitive myth of Sutung's mead. Furthermore, in Stagnelius'

fragment *Svegder* we have really nothing but Christian ideals in the garb of Norse mythology, the personification of which is the Christ-Odin himself, much as was the priest of Balder in Tegnér's *Frithiofssaga*.

The transition from Norse heathendom to Christianity is the theme of the concluding chapter. Oehlenschläger's influence is, of course, predominant, but the author shows that Fouqué, too, may have influenced the Gothic background. Nicander's *Runesvärdet*, for instance, shows a marked similarity with Oehlenschläger's viking dramas. The saga element is the most successful feature of the play, in which the author's sympathy (as was the case with Oehlenschläger) is evidently on the side of the pagan viking. Though dramatic in form, the work is essentially poetical and lyrical, which points towards the neo-Romantic relationship.

Dr. Benson's work concludes with an admirable summary of his thesis and with a very useful Appendix, containing biographical and critical notes.

The work will be welcomed by all students of Scandinavian literature as a most enlightening exposition of the Gothic elements in Swedish Romanticism, a subject which heretofore had received neither full nor sound treatment.

ALBERT MOREY STURTEVANT.

Kansas University.

CORRESPONDENCE

ADAM'S MOTIVE

The verse of *Genesis* upon which Milton based his account of the "first disobedience" is this: "And when the woman saw that the tree was good for food, and that it was pleasant to the eyes, and a tree to be desired to make one wise, she took of the fruit thereof, and did eat, and gave also to her husband; and he did eat." Here the motive for Adam's eating the forbidden fruit is not clear, unless we suppose that he did it unthinkingly, for Adam replied to God's question merely, "The woman whom thou gavest to be with me, she gave me of the tree, and I did eat,"—the same question to

which Eve replied, "The serpent beguiled me, and I did eat." The reasons why Eve transgressed seem clear enough: the attractiveness of the fruit, feminine curiosity to find out what "the knowledge of good and evil" was, and perhaps a little feminine wilfulness and perversity to do what she had been told not to. We may suppose, and indeed the reader usually does suppose, that Adam's motive was no more than the same sort of curiosity and wilfulness, to which we may add the winning manner in which the beautiful woman probably begged him to partake. At any rate, Adam laid the blame upon Eve, and she in turn laid it upon the serpent, with no hint of any romance in the whole transaction.

Now, as a matter of fact, Milton followed his Old Testament rather closely, but he added to the story a background and framework of ethical, spiritual, philosophical, and human significance which made it impossible for him to handle the transgression in any such simple and noncommittal way as it is handled in the third chapter of Genesis. He had to dramatize, rationalize, humanize. In order to make his characters more full, more individual, and more interesting he had to imagine motives where there were none, expanding into twelve books a simple narrative of a few hundred words. Thus even the casual reader sees that he must expect to find in *Paradise Lost* many things lacking in the Bible story; yet I think he fails to appreciate the fact that Milton gave the tale a wholly romantic turn, in making Adam's motive in yielding that of—love. Four passages, serving as prelude, note, and comment of the action itself, prove that Milton intended that love should be taken as the spring of Adam's act. Many other lines might be cited, but these are particularly significant:

(1) . . . some cursed fraud
Of enemy hath beguil'd thee, yet unknown,
And me with thee hath ruin'd, for with thee
Certain my resolution is to die;
(*P. L.*, ix, 904.)

(2) I with thee have fixt my lot,
Certain to undergo like doom; if death
Consort with thee, death is to me as life;
So forcible within my breast I feel

The bond of nature draw me to my own,
My own in thee, for what thou art is mine;
Our state cannot be sever'd; we are one,
One flesh; to lose thee were to lose myself;

(*P. L.*, ix, 952.)

(3) . . . he scrupled not to eat
Against his better knowledge, not deceiv'd,
But fondly overcome by female charm;
(*P. L.*, ix, 997.)

(4) I, who might have liv'd and joy'd immortal bliss,
Yet willingly chose rather death with thee.
(*P. L.*, ix, 1165.)

From these passages it becomes evident that it was no mere temptation of curiosity idly yielded to, but the deliberate and significant decision of a thinking man. That the third passage means only this, and not that Adam was superficially seduced by Eve's charms, we learn from the second passage quoted, as well as from other parts of the poem. Professor Dowden, in *Puritan and Anglican*, examines the subject at length, yet lays too little stress on the definiteness of Milton's ideas about the transgression itself; for close study of the text of *Paradise Lost*, *Paradise Regained*, *Samson Agonistes*, and the *Christian Doctrine* reveals Milton's clear and coherent philosophy, a part of which he incorporated in the story of the Garden; so that these remarks are not critical conjecture, but citation of Milton himself.

There has always been something heroic in the nobility of a sacrifice for love, whether the love be always worthy or not, yet in this case Milton would have us believe that Adam's affection was admirable and sincere, so far as it went. The man's mistake, according to Milton (compare, for example, the third passage above), was in letting his feelings overmaster him to the point of making him do that sin which God had expressly forbidden. Since the Tree of Knowledge was the sole symbol and pledge of human obedience to God, the eating of the fruit meant more than mere disobedience, in all that disobedience to God implied (cf. *P. L.* i, 33; iii, 204–211; *P. R.* iii, 137; *Ch. D.* in Bohn ed. IV, 254; Dowden, *Puritan and Anglican*, 186), and humanity has suffered for it ever since, Milton believed. The magnitude of the evil, however, has nothing to do with the act itself, and Adam knew what his sacri-

fice meant, having been adequately warned. He knew, says Milton, that Eve was lost by her sin, so that with noble chivalry and devotion he decided to die with her. Milton's point, many times emphasized in his works, was that a man may well love a beautiful woman, but that he should not let his passion obscure his judgment, and should follow his conscience and his intelligence in spite of the lovely but capricious sex, lest "wommen shal him bringen to mischaunce." The statement, however, remains true and worthy of note, that Milton gave his epic the romantic motive of love.

ELLIOTT A. WHITE.

University of Missouri.

CHAUCER AND THE HOURS OF THE BLESSED
VIRGIN

Professor F. Tupper¹ has recently demonstrated beyond doubt that Chaucer, in composing the *Invocatio ad Mariam* which stands in the Prologue of the *Lyf of St. Cecile*, made direct use of the Hours of the B. V. M. A year and a half ago, while turning the pages of an English text of the *Mateyns of Oure Lady* in the Bodleian Library (ms. Ashmole 1288), I was so forcibly impressed by the similarity to Chaucer's phrases that I transcribed from it the passage which follows. It supplies, as will be seen, a somewhat closer parallel than the extract which Tupper reprints from Littlehales:

[fol. 49b] Antym of oure lady: Salue regina mater.

Heil qweene modir of merci. heil lijf swetnesse & oure hope: to þee we crien outlawid sones of eue. to þee we sigen weymentyng and wepinge in þis valey of teiris: hige þou þerfore oure aduocat turne to us þou [fol. 50] þi merciful igen, and schewe þou to us ihesu þe blesid fruyt of þi wombe aftir þis exilyng.

Versus. virgyne modir of þe chirche. Euerlastinge gate of glorie. geue þou to us refuyt Anentis þe fadir & þe² sone.

Responsio. O merciful.

Versus. Virgyne merciful. virgyne piteuous. O marie swete virgyne. Heere þe preiers of meke men: to þee piteuously criyng.

Responsio. O piteuous.

Versus. gete out preiers to þi sone ficchid to

¹ *Mod. Lang. Notes*, Jan., 1915.

² Ms. þe repeated.

þe eros ful of woundis: and for us al forscougid with þornes prickid gouen galle to drynke.

Responsio. O swete.

Versus. Glorious modir of god Of whom þe sone was fadir. Preie for us all þat of þee maken mynde.

Responsio. O meke.

Versus. Do awey blamys of wrecchidnesse Clense þe filpe of synners: geue [fol. 50b] to us þoru þi preiers lijf of blesid men.

Responsio. O sely.

Versus. Reisid aboue heuenes And crowned of þi child. In þis wrecchid valey To gilty be lady of forgeuenenesse.

Responsio. O holy.

Versus. Pat he lose us fro synnes for þe loue of his modir & to þe kyngdom of clernessee lede us þe kyng of pitee.

Responsio. O merciful. O piteous. O holy O meke O sely O swete marie heil.

Versus. Heil ful of grace þe lord is wiþ þee.

Responsio. Blessid be þou among alle wommen and blesid be þe fruyt of þi wombe. Preie we, &c.

Professor Tupper's further observation—it can hardly be termed a discovery—that saints' lives and Miracles of the Virgin (and, one may add, even romances) are frequently prefaced by Invocations, somewhat diminishes the force of his previous suggestion, that in the present instance Chaucer intended his Invocation as a "protest against Sloth in its phase of Undevotion."³ At least it may be doubted whether the "fine fitness" which he perceives here, in his attempt to arrange certain of the Canterbury Tales according to a scheme of the Seven Deadly Sins, was sufficiently obvious to be perceptible to a reader not already in the secret.

"The time-honored function of such a prelude as Chaucer's 'Invocacio ad Mariam,'" Professor Tupper concludes, "constitutes good ground for believing that it was composed at the same time as the Life of Saint Cecilia." But in one important respect Chaucer's Hymn to Mary differs from all the Invocations cited by Professor Tupper, and from all others with which I am acquainted. It does not stand at the beginning of the piece—as an Invocation should—but is introduced in the midst of the prologue, in such fashion that it can be re-

³ *Publ. Mod. Lang. Assn.* XXIX, 107.

moved, not only without detriment, but with positive improvement, to the context. There is no need to repeat the considerations which I have elsewhere presented on this point,* but the real problem is not affected by the fact that religious poems are frequently introduced by Invocations.

CARLETON BROWN.

Bryn Mawr College.

THOMAS EDWARDS'S SONNETS

In *Modern Language Notes* for April, 1905, Prof. E. P. Morton includes in a list of fifty sonnets written between 1658 and 1750 only the two sonnets of Thomas Edwards, 1746 and 1747, "discovered by Prof. Phelps." Neither Prof. Morton nor Prof. Phelps has indicated which of Edwards's sonnets these two were. However, at least thirteen of Edwards's sonnets were published before 1750 and two others in that year. The thirteen sonnets referred to were published in *A Collection of Poems by Several Hands*, edited by and printed for R. Dodsley, second edition, London, 1748, 8°, volume II, p. 323 ff. The thirteenth is inscribed, "To the Rt. Hon. Mr. ——, with the foregoing Sonnets." These sonnets do not appear in the duodecimo edition of Dodsley's Collection in the same year; they do appear in the later editions, 1755 and 1758, and in the seventh edition of the *Canons of Criticism*, 1765. The other two were printed in the fourth edition of Edwards's *Canons of Criticism*, 1750, and both are in ridicule of Warburton. The sonnet beginning "Tongue-doughty Pedant" is on page (14), and the one beginning "Rest, rest perturbed Spirit" is in the Appendix, p. 176.

CLARISSA RINAKER.

The University of Illinois.

BRIEF MENTION

Five years after the death of Adolf Tobler, and more than forty since he announced the work as forthcoming, the first *lieferung* of his

* *Mod. Philol.* IX, 1-16.

Altfranzösisches Wörterbuch has now appeared (Berlin, Weidmannsche Buchhandlung. 25 lieferungen). The editor, Erhard Lommatsch, did not have a light task, for the cards on which the entries had been made were by no means in order for printing. The initial *lieferung* is largely given over to introductory matter, so that the dictionary text occupies only twenty-four out of the ninety-four pages. These bring us as far as the word *abevrer*, half of the forty-eight closely printed columns being devoted to the preposition *à*. In contrast with Godefroy, Tobler did not draw on unpublished documents, but hardly a printed text of the Old French literature escaped his analysis, as may be seen from an examination of the twenty-seven page list of works from which citations have been made. A test count of words in the two dictionaries indicates that in spite of the more compact typography of the Tobler the amount of material per column is approximately the same. About 4800 columns are promised for the Tobler as against some 24000 in the Godefroy. Yet Tobler's exceptionally full treatment of the preposition *à* is half as long again as Godefroy's, and the whole section so far covered in Tobler occupies nearly sixty per cent. of the corresponding words in Godefroy (even including the *complément*), so that it is difficult to see how the indicated limit can be maintained. In the descriptive and explanatory introduction, the editor has illustrated some of the manifold ways in which this mine of lexicographical material can be utilized to enrich our knowledge of French linguistics. It is a tragic coincidence that the publication of this work, the longest and most eagerly awaited of all that have been promised in Romance philology, begins at a time when few of the younger generation of those who watched for its coming will so much as learn of its appearance.

The *Modern Language Notes* is scarcely the appropriate place for an extended review of *Die Erste Deutsche Bibel* (Stuttgarter Literarischer Verein, 1904-15), nor, if it were, would it be an easy task to find the competent reviewer. With the appearance of the tenth and final volume, it seems fitting, however, to call at least passing attention to the completion of so monumental a work on the part of the American scholar, William Kurrelmeyer. The ten stately volumes now before us embody the results of twelve years of unwearied labor. Critical acumen, broad and sound learning, perseverance in the face of enormous obstacles, all these were needed to bring such a task to a successful conclusion.